

THE
CONGREGATIONAL MAGAZINE.

DECEMBER, 1843.

SOLEMN ADHERENCE OF THE CONGREGATIONAL UNION
TO EVANGELICAL TRUTH.

AMONGST the many important questions which engaged the attention of the ministers, delegates, and brethren of the Congregational Union assembled at their autumnal meeting at Leeds, none appear to us so seasonable and momentous as the subjects contained in the documents which were read and adopted, on the duty of our pastors and churches, our tutors and students, solemnly to adhere, with all zeal and stedfastness, to evangelical truth, and to a warm and faithful exhibition of it, both from the preacher's desk and the professor's chair.

We therefore place these most instructive and important papers on the first pages of this number, that they may obtain the attention they demand; whilst we beg to refer our readers to the discussion which took place upon them, a report of which they will find in the subsequent "Transactions." We earnestly commend these to the serious and prayerful attention of our brethren, and trust that the trumpets on the walls of our Zion, will never fail to give "a certain sound." We hope shortly to secure an opportunity of recurring to this vital subject.

MEMORIAL ON THE DUTY OF A STEDFAST ADHERENCE TO
EVANGELICAL TRUTH, &c.

Among the objects contemplated in the formation of this Union, one undoubtedly was, that its proceedings should exert a favourable influence on the tone of thought and feeling throughout the body of Christians with which it stands in immediate connexion. Those who have laboured to form and to maintain this Union, have done so in the hope that the devotions, the counsels, and the impulses of its public assemblies, and the opinions and appeals embodied in its published documents, would contribute to preserve the evangelical theology, and to animate the evangelical spirit of the entire denomination. Nor can

any proceedings be better adapted to promote results so desirable, than those of this Union, in the public meetings of which, as on this day, the brethren assembled may calmly and devoutly discuss the signs of the times; the present position of the Independent churches in relation to the general interests of the kingdom of Christ; and the duties which, at such a time, demand the energy and fidelity of a body of Christians professedly set for the defence of the truth. As such discussions can hardly fail to guide and strengthen in their course of action, those who bear part in them, so the publication of sentiments thus matured by the wisdom, and imbued with the spirit of fraternal and devout consultation, must impart a similar, if not an equal, benefit to those who peruse them.

In this view of the intended working and benefits of the Union, it must be the duty of the Committee, entrusted for the most part with the origination and guidance of its proceedings, to observe under what aspect of general affairs its successive meetings assemble, that their deliberations may possess appropriate and practical adaptation to contemporary exigencies of danger, or calls of duty. On no occasion could this course be more necessary, on none less difficult, than on the present, when the religious aspect of this country cannot be mistaken, and is as threatening as it is apparent; and when the line of duty relative to it, marked out for this assembly, and the body it represents, is no less plain than it is important. And at such a period it would be most inexcusable that a numerous body of professedly evangelical ministers should assemble for deliberation and prayer, without special solicitude to render the occasion subservient to the advancement of the great interests of Gospel truth and vital godliness.

It is open to the view of every observer, that the religious temper and movement of the present period have taken a direction strongly in favour of priestly character and functions in the ministers of the Gospel, and of sacramental efficacy in producing and sustaining the personal religion of the people. Inquiry and thought are not necessary to discover that such is the fact. It is, on the contrary, openly displayed and forced on the view of even the inattentive and unconcerned. To determine which of the branches of this twofold corruption is the more injurious to truth, piety, and salvation, is quite superfluous, as they must necessarily be always associated, forming together that "other gospel," repudiated with such energy and indignation by the apostle—the priesthood of the minister amounting to nothing unless he can perform for the people services of peculiar efficacy, and the peculiar efficacy of his ministrations being all a fable, unless those who receive them are by their sole virtue effectually benefited. Nor is the evil more plain than the remedy. To priests, we must oppose preachers. Instead of sacraments, we must exhibit truth as the great instrument of salvation. In place of a blind confidence in rites, we must teach

men salvation by faith in Christ. We must contend for the life of religion in the soul, produced by the power of the Spirit, as opposed to a mere routine of forms, with whatever solemnity administered, with whatever scrupulosity observed, with whatever pretensions recommended.

Nor must this renewed movement in favour of the hierarchical form of church government, and of sacramental modes of administering religion, be regarded with contempt, as absurd or feeble. Present experience is confirming the testimony of all history, that the entire system has great charms for the human mind, and can exert a most commanding influence over conscience by the terrors and the hopes it too well knows how to excite, unfounded in truth as either or both may be. As little will it be wise or safe to put confidence in the boasted enlightenment of the people in this age of advanced liberty and intelligence. Refinement, freedom, discoveries in physical science, diffused knowledge, form no securities that men will prefer the pure Gospel of Christ to specious promises of religious safety, to be obtained by an imposing and splendid ritual, and of religious ease and quiet, to be secured by the authority of a venerable order of spiritual governors. Nor shall we less err, if we suppose that, because the ministers of the various non-established churches of the country form a numerous body of faithful witnesses to evangelical truth, their testimony will be successful against the advocates of sacramental salvation, unless it be borne with great ardour and life, as well as fidelity; because the danger from the great and ancient system of error, now revived, arises chiefly from the glow and spirit with which, though till recently so torpid and lifeless, it is now again vivified. A warm and animated preaching of the Gospel will be all-powerful against any system of formalism, but we must not depend on a frigid and feeble orthodoxy as the antagonist of vigorous, zealous, confident superstition.

To a body of brethren whose glory is the cross; whose chosen vocation is strictly spiritual; to whom political movements have been generally distasteful, and only entered on for the sake of higher interests and objects; who have embraced a cause and a position, despised in general society, solely for the sake of the dear and glorious truths of the Gospel; it must be a welcome announcement that the peculiar claims of the times, of the church, of their country, on them, is now a faithful and vigorous testimony to the Gospel. They will, even though disappointed in some cherished political designs, feel consoled for the failure, when they perceive that the same Providence which plainly called on them some years ago, for a resolute movement of political activity, now as plainly summons them to the more congenial duty of an undivided and strenuous advocacy of the peculiar doctrines of the Gospel. Not that the claims of this duty have ever been diminished or suspended at any time, or under any circumstances; or

that now it can be thought necessary or wise to be altogether indifferent and inactive in respect to political opinions and interests. Not either. But that the period for unwonted political activity appearing to be past, and the necessity for a strenuous testimony to evangelical truth being more than ever strong and apparent, the undiverted attention and energy of faithful ministers may be gladly given to a testimony for the truth.

A first inquiry of equal interest and importance is, whether our churches and pastors retain the truth in its integrity and purity—the truth of their great predecessors—of Luther, of Owen, of Whitfield? If they retain it not, they are totally unprepared for the crisis in which they are called to act, and must go unarmed to meet the formidable antagonists with whom they are summoned to contend. In respect to their own peculiar position as a body of Christians, separated from the religious establishment of their country, nothing can, as nothing ought to, sustain them but the possession and love of this truth; apart from which, neither attachment to the voluntary system, nor liberal opinions, nor simple worship, nor scriptural church government, nor all combined, can be their life and strength, amidst the many secular disadvantages and varied hostile influences, by which they are surrounded. Whereas, if the truth be still indeed their treasure and their glory—if for it they encounter social disadvantages—if for it they adopt liberal sentiments, and advocate religious liberty—then the truth will hallow their cause, sanctify their freedom, and give them victory over enemies, which not they, but only the truth, can overcome.

It is hoped and believed that the churches and pastors of our denomination do retain all the great principles of evangelical truth; that they do glory in the cross of Christ; that they do deem salvation by grace through faith their treasure and their joy. In forming a judgment on such a question, it will be necessary to make allowance for some peculiarities in modes of viewing and stating great truths. Such peculiarities vary continually. Each succeeding generation presents its own class of special modes in the statement of truths, the same in substance and in spirit. But, while these peculiarities are regarded as harmless,—it may be as beneficial, so long as what is essential in truth is not damaged, or is even perhaps subserved by them,—care is needed, lest through this medium error should find entrance, and truth receive injury. There has been prevailing with many pastors, a happy and laudable zeal to convert souls, and to enlarge churches. One occasion of this holy impulse have no doubt been the accounts received of great revivals and numerous conversions, vouchsafed to the labours of our American brethren. Nothing was more natural than that those who longed for like success, should in some measure adopt means to obtain it, similar to those employed where it had been so largely realised. Among these were the special methods of addressing truth to the

people, in connexion with which it had been found quick and powerful, and so many had been pricked to the heart. The principal peculiarity in the most successful American preaching would seem to have been the pressing of immediate repentance, faith, and decided turning to God; in order to enforce which, great stress was laid upon the moral obligation and natural ability of men to receive the Gospel. These are views not in themselves novel or erroneous. The prominent statement of them, however, gave a peculiar character and tone to what, for the sake of distinction, may be termed revival preaching, and led probably to less frequent and forcible statements of another class of truths relating to the work of grace, and the power of the Spirit,—not that this latter portion of vital truth has been denied or undervalued, but only for the time laid aside, as possibly, if blended with appeal and expostulation, tending to diminish its pungency and force. To an observer, looking closely at the comparative modes of exhibiting truth, and dealing with souls, adopted by those beloved brethren, and by some other eminently successful preachers, it may seem as if, while in substance the same doctrines are declared, there may be traced some difference as to the ground on which success in the two cases has been hoped for. In the modern effort, it may rather seem, "This truth is what the minds of the people must yield to, and be conquered by." It was rather with Whitfield and his associates for instance, "This is the truth God the Spirit will apply, and bless, and render effectual to conversion." The Puritans preached the Gospel chiefly as doctrinal truth. The early Methodists chiefly as the sword of the Spirit. The modern revivalists rather as the vanquisher of the will and conscience. Happy they who can combine and harmonise this three-fold conception of the one doctrine; and in their statements of truth, their appeals to the people, and their dependence on God, can blend, in due proportions, the distinctive excellences of these several classes of masters in Israel. It may be permitted to express such jealousy as arises only from love of the truth, and is consistent with the most approving sense of the zeal of brethren anxious for enlarged usefulness, as well as with the most candid consideration of the methods adopted by them to secure it, lest a beginning to swerve from the whole unimpaired system of evangelical truth be made at this point, wherein an earnest desire of practical good may be the innocent and plausible occasion of departure from sound doctrine.

As for the prevailing errors of the day, they, it is hoped, will bind the whole Congregational brotherhood by stronger ties and warmer attachments than ever to the Gospel. If the present period be to themselves, in some degree, a time of trial, to the truth it is much more so. If new life be infused into old errors,—if the same falsehoods which were once grossly, be now more plausibly defended,—if what is ruinous in doctrine be now presented in association with what seems most esti-

mable in character,—if it is now sought to uphold all the splendour, power, and dignity of an unscriptural hierarchy, by all that is fatal to souls in sacramental piety and salvation,—at such a time it may be more than pardoned, if the Congregational body, among many acknowledged and lamented defects, should yet deem itself, with other unendowed evangelical churches in this country, reserved by God's good providence to act a part in the emergency; as set for the defence of the truth, and called upon by considerations far superior to those of party, or distinctions of church polity, to contend more earnestly than ever in defence of the faith once delivered to the saints. To fail of this view and purpose at the present juncture, would be to show themselves unwise in counsel, narrow in view, sectarian in spirit, and unprepared for anything great, disinterested, and of power for the present and the future in the sacred cause of truth, of souls, and of Christ.

But wisdom seems to require that no less stress should be laid on the energy than on the accuracy with which the Gospel must be preached, to meet the wants and dangers of the present time. The evil to be resisted is in energetic action; and energy must be met by energy—zeal with zeal. Besides, the truths of the Gospel, always distasteful to the majority, are doubly so when unaccompanied with warmth in those who advocate them. Cold and formal orthodoxy, evangelical professions without heart and unction, the high claims of the Gospel without its tender compassions, as they will receive no blessing from God, so they will have no power with men; but, on the contrary, as they do the highest wrong and injustice to the Gospel, so will they be the ruin of the pastors and churches by whom it is thus enfeebled and chilled. A ritual service may be a substitute for vital religion and warm devotion: its splendour, its charms for the senses, its low claims and easy terms for conscience, may gratify while they delude the carnal mind. Evangelical truth cannot be so degraded. Its claims, its mysteries, its grace, its sanctity, as they cannot be changed, so neither can they be compromised or employed as substitutes for the piety their whole tendency is to produce. They come warm and living from the mind of God, the cross of Christ, the word of the Spirit; and are only represented and administered with truth, when they possess, warm, and sanctify the men through whom they are to be proclaimed and testified to their fellow-sinners. Formal orthodoxy will be as fatal to our cause as an erroneous theology, and will even more deprive our churches and pastors of influence in society; as, with the latter they might find a favour with the world for worldly objects and purposes, of which the former will deprive them, as well as of all power to promote the sacred cause of the glorious Gospel.

These brief and imperfect representations are, with deference, submitted to the present meeting, as an introduction to fraternal discussion on the important subject to which they refer, and as the preface

to a more formal and condensed declaration of the same views, now to be proposed for the adoption of the meeting, that it may record and publish its views on the course of duty to which the churches and pastors of the Congregational body are summoned, at this eventful and critical period.

APPEAL TO THE INDEPENDENT CHURCHES THROUGHOUT THE BRITISH EMPIRE, AND TO THEIR BISHOPS AND DEACONS, ON THE IMPORTANCE OF A DECIDED TESTIMONY TO EVANGELICAL TRUTH AT THE PRESENT CRISIS.

The brethren convened at this adjourned session of the Thirteenth Annual Assembly of the Congregational Union, having given serious consideration to the state of the cause and truth of Christ in their native country at this time, feel it their duty to publish their sentiments on this great subject in the following form, not in controversy, or for accusation, or with authority; but in love to their Saviour and his truth, to their brethren and the souls of men; and in hope that this their declaration may awaken their own zeal, and that of many others, in efforts to maintain and to spread the pure and saving truth of the glorious Gospel.

The brethren avow their deepened conviction of the scriptural truth of the doctrines which embody essentially the salvation of the Gospel—the doctrines of grace—of the free, rich, and glorious mercy of God to man in Christ. These doctrines they do not define. What is intended, will be easily understood. They are speaking of salvation by grace through faith, of full and free pardon through Christ crucified to guilty sinners, on their repentance and faith in the Lord Jesus. To this vital and central point in the Gospel, the attention of the churches is especially directed, because another salvation is now by many recommended; and an entirely different view of the Gospel is by too many proclaimed. The brethren delight to be summoned to the consideration of this subject. It is dear to their hearts, and glorious in their view. At one time, free grace and full salvation seemed peculiarly liable to abuse from Antinomian and licentious sentiments. Then the faithful advocates of the true Gospel were called on to contend for, and bring into prominent notice, the practical, holy character and tendencies of God's grace in Christ. Now, on the contrary, when the legal, papal spirit abounds, and men are taught salvation by sacraments, penance, and connexion with what claims to be the only true church,—the servants of Christ seem bound to publish the free and abounding grace of the Gospel as with the sound of the trumpet. The brethren put the question to themselves with earnestness, to others with respect, Is the Gospel enough preached? Are the first simple verities respecting the love of God, the grace of Christ, the great salvation by faith, insisted on with the frequency, prominence, and earnestness, demanded

not only by their own glory and importance, but by the peculiar character of the present times ?

The brethren do not speak of these doctrines as embodied in any creed, or as strictly defined for the accurate declarations of controversy, and for defence against the subtleties of error. These modes of setting forth truth have great value and importance, but at present the brethren are speaking of God's gracious truth as it is warm, simple, and living, in his inspired word ; as it should be taken among brethren who have confidence in each other's known attachment to the Gospel ; as it should be preached with popular freedom and ardour for the conversion of sinners, and the joy of saints. In this respect, the pastors and brethren of the Congregational churches have always walked by rules of charity and liberty, and this course they have found that of safety and peace. They have been careful to secure great truths and the right spirit ; then they have known that lesser differences of sentiment, or of modes of interpretation, can, and ought to be charitably borne with. The brethren see that this is no time or place for settling niceties of phrase and sentiment. The times, in their view, demand great truths, great views, great impulses—whatever has power to harmonise and animate the friends of truth, the servants of Christ.

The brethren now assembled have turned their thoughts to the fact confirmed by the history of the past, and by observation of the present, that the truths and the preaching now recommended, have power. They are of God. In their own nature they are mighty. Divine influence ever accompanies them. Using them, the feeble are strong, and the simple wise. Apostolic days, the times of reformation, the struggles of the Puritans, the labours of the Methodists, the triumphs of modern missions—all witness that the preaching of the cross is mighty through God. Nothing else will be mighty for our work, or against our adversaries. In our own times, the people will hear the Gospel. No minister preaches the Gospel vigorously in vain. Therefore, the brethren in the ministry present, charge it on their souls ; and all present, with respect and affection, recommend to the pastors of the churches, and especially to the younger pastors, that the preaching of the Gospel should be their work, their joy, their glory—that on this theme they should rest their hope of success with men, and of acceptance with God. If taste and talent and eloquence can be employed to subserve the Gospel, let these choice gifts be consecrated to that honourable and blessed service ; but it is the deliberate judgment of the brethren present, that no powers, no attainments, no accomplishments, will now avail the Christian minister, apart from a clear, plain, strong statement, of the great points of saving Gospel truth. So deeply are the brethren of this conviction, that they cannot forbear an affectionate appeal to the honoured tutors of the colleges on this

subject. Will those eminent brethren candidly receive the avowal, that this meeting will think the work of teaching the young minister then only complete, when, in addition to sound theology, there is impressed continually on his mind, the necessity that he should consecrate all the powers of his soul to preaching Christ Jesus, and Him crucified? And the meeting must add the expression of its respectful and affectionate, but deep anxiety for the rising ministry on this point. Great will be the joy and confidence of the brethren present, in whatever proofs they can perceive that the young pastors of the churches enter on public service with thoroughly evangelical sentiments and purposes—determined to know nothing among the people, but Christ Jesus, and Him crucified—willing to be despised as plain, rude, unwise, so they be but mighty and blessed in preaching the cross.

This meeting would also bear its testimony on the importance of union among all who love the Gospel, in these times of active and spreading error. For the sake of the truth—for the sake of strength and encouragement in its defence—for the purpose of lifting up a standard against the enemy now he comes in like a flood, the meeting testifies its sense of the importance of union and co-operation among all faithful ministers of the Gospel, of the same or of differing denominations. That such brethren in their several districts should exchange pulpits, or unite in series of lectures for the express purpose of declaring their agreement in the vital doctrines of the Gospel, their sense of the dangers by which those truths are now assailed, and their determination to employ every energy, and every legitimate means for their defence.

Finally, the meeting declares its sense of the importance of prayer at this crisis; prayer that God would arise and defend his own truth,—that he would endow his servants with courage, wisdom, and ardour, in contending earnestly for it—that he would raise up men equal to the times, and valiant for the truth. The meeting is entirely convinced that the times and the occasion demand this spirit of prayer; that if it be granted and exercised, the cause of God is sure of deliverance and success; that without it the friends of the Gospel will be feeble, and the enemy will triumph. In the closet, therefore, in the family circle, in the sanctuary, let prayer be frequent, distinct, and importunate, that in this time of deep interest and spreading danger, of mingled hope and fear, of intense struggle and universal effort, the Lord will work by every influence, by every instrument, friendly or adverse, for the purity, the power, and the spread of his own glorious and simple truth—that He “so loved the world, that He gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on Him might not perish, but have everlasting life.”

OUR DENOMINATIONAL LITERATURE IN IRELAND.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CONGREGATIONAL MAGAZINE.

SIR,—It is a circumstance which reflects the greatest honour on the Congregational body, that many of its ministers have been able, amidst the onerous and multifarious duties of the pastoral office, to produce works deserving to rank among the first publications of the age, both for sound learning and enlightened exposition of Christian doctrine. If some of them are deficient in the delicacies of taste, and the fascinating graces of style, that defect may be ascribed to the too theological nature of their education, and a course of reading in after life somewhat exclusively professional.

It may, however, be alleged, without any invidious comparisons, which the sensitiveness of sectarian feeling would hardly brook, that the Independents have made most valuable contributions to the Christian literature of the age. This fact has been cheerfully acknowledged by the most distinguished ornaments of other churches.

Yet it must be confessed, that our people have not derived as much advantage from this as might have been expected. They are sadly deficient in public spirit and a proper *esprit de corps*. I should be sorry, indeed, to give an advice on this subject similar to that given by Dr. Adam Clarke to his "*Preacher*," and to say, that all needful books on *every* subject have proceeded from our own body. An exclusive perusal of the books of one denomination, however excellent they may be, produces, almost of necessity, the contracted spirit of bigotry and intolerance.

But if there be no desire to possess and to study the best productions of those whose talents and learning have rendered our name respectable in the eyes of Christendom, it speaks as little for our mental cultivation, as it does for our religious zeal. And yet there are persons among us, of ample means and leisure, who confine their reading to a few odd volumes of the old divines, and will not know what you mean if you speak to them of the *Congregational Lecture*. They are strangers even to our periodicals. The *Eclectic Review* and *Congregational Magazine* they have never seen; of late the *Evangelical Magazine* may have found its way among them. As to *The Patriot*, and other papers connected with the English dissenters, they know nothing of them, or of the people, whose organs they are, except what they may chance to learn from an abusive allusion in their local tory paper. Some of these pious souls devoutly believe that Dr. Pye Smith is a factious political agitator, whose violence knows no bounds! and they sigh heavily at the secularity of English Independents in general. To this state of mind they are often brought by the misrepresentations of prelatial clergymen and *Christian brethren*; while several of our own ministers and missionaries, alas! cannot set them right, just because they are as profoundly ignorant of these matters as themselves. Hence they silently acquiesce in the censure, or, perhaps,

adventure a timid apology, or a whining regret, instead of making themselves acquainted with the facts, and meekly, but manfully, asserting the truth.

Some of your readers may stare at this statement, and deem it untrue; but I am speaking of *Ireland*, and can assure you, that this is only a small portion of what I could relate of the want of public spirit, and the moral cowardice, which have rendered our cause in many localities so contemptible. Let it not be supposed, however, that I mean to involve all our ministers, or the majority of them, in these remarks. We have our men of talent, learning, and literature—men who come fully up to the demand of the times, and would be the ornaments of any church in Christendom.

The ambiguous features and feeble condition of Irish Independency may be ascribed to many causes: to the "catholicity" of our missions, the poverty of our ministers, and the time-serving caution or political servility of our people, yielding passively to the overwhelming pressure of the church party, backed by the landlords and gentry. Another cause may be found in our mistaken policy regarding the formation of churches. A few persons, mostly women, headed by some ambitious or crotchety gentleman or lady, have been *prematurely* constituted (or rather called by courtesy) a church, and then they have speedily assumed the absolute power of an independent democracy. But the male or female leader, having every means of wealth, influence, and contention, kept the rest in subjection, and made it the grand object of their existence *to rule the minister*; or, if he would not be ruled, to have him removed, to make room for one more pliant and manageable. Unhappily, this was not difficult, as some of our men were educated in the principles of passive obedience, and too often sacrificed their rights to their peace; while committees, whether in Dublin or London (for there was no difference in this), gave too ready an ear to tittle-tattle and complaint. How could our ministers evince manly independence in such a state of things? How could they be respected by other bodies, even if a due regard had been paid to their qualifications as candidates, which was not always the case?

It was from a praiseworthy regard to the liberties and privileges of a Christian church, however feeble and eleemosynary, that the *Irish Evangelical Society* allowed its agents, in so many cases, to merge the missionary in the pastor; and not only to waste their energies on little companies of sanctimonious malcontents thrown into juxtaposition,—misnamed fellowship,—but to have their peace marred, their office lowered, their ministry frustrated, by a petty vulgar despotism ludicrously aping the style and authority of a church.*

* Severe as these remarks may seem to be, yet we fear that circumstances have occurred to justify them. Sufficient attention has not been paid to the necessary distinction between a missionary station and an Independent church. How can a society be truly independent, which derives its support from an extraneous source?

OUR DENOMINATIONAL LITERATURE IN IRELAND.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CONGREGATIONAL MAGAZINE.

SIR,—It is a circumstance which reflects the greatest honour on the Congregational body, that many of its ministers have been able, amidst the onerous and multifarious duties of the pastoral office, to produce works deserving to rank among the first publications of the age, both for sound learning and enlightened exposition of Christian doctrine. If some of them are deficient in the delicacies of taste, and the fascinating graces of style, that defect may be ascribed to the too theological nature of their education, and a course of reading in after life somewhat exclusively professional.

It may, however, be alleged, without any invidious comparisons, which the sensitiveness of sectarian feeling would hardly brook, that the Independents have made most valuable contributions to the Christian literature of the age. This fact has been cheerfully acknowledged by the most distinguished ornaments of other churches.

Yet it must be confessed, that our people have not derived as much advantage from this as might have been expected. They are sadly deficient in public spirit and a proper *esprit de corps*. I should be sorry, indeed, to give an advice on this subject similar to that given by Dr. Adam Clarke to his "*Preacher*," and to say, that all needful books on *every* subject have proceeded from our own body. An exclusive perusal of the books of one denomination, however excellent they may be, produces, almost of necessity, the contracted spirit of bigotry and intolerance.

But if there be no desire to possess and to study the best productions of those whose talents and learning have rendered our name respectable in the eyes of Christendom, it speaks as little for our mental cultivation, as it does for our religious zeal. And yet there are persons among us, of ample means and leisure, who confine their reading to a few odd volumes of the old divines, and will not know what you mean if you speak to them of the *Congregational Lecture*. They are strangers even to our periodicals. The *Eclectic Review* and *Congregational Magazine* they have never seen; of late the *Evangelical Magazine* may have found its way among them. As to *The Patriot*, and other papers connected with the English dissenters, they know nothing of them, or of the people, whose organs they are, except what they may chance to learn from an abusive allusion in their local tory paper. Some of these pious souls devoutly believe that Dr. Pye Smith is a factious political agitator, whose violence knows no bounds! and they sigh heavily at the secularity of English Independents in general. To this state of mind they are often brought by the misrepresentations of prelatial clergymen and *Christian brethren*; while several of our own ministers and missionaries, alas! cannot set them right, just because they are as profoundly ignorant of these matters as themselves. Hence they silently acquiesce in the censure, or, perhaps,

adventure a timid apology, or a whining regret, instead of making themselves acquainted with the facts, and meekly, but manfully, asserting the truth.

Some of your readers may stare at this statement, and deem it untrue; but I am speaking of *Ireland*, and can assure you, that this is only a small portion of what I could relate of the want of public spirit, and the moral cowardice, which have rendered our cause in many localities so contemptible. Let it not be supposed, however, that I mean to involve all our ministers, or the majority of them, in these remarks. We have our men of talent, learning, and literature—men who come fully up to the demand of the times, and would be the ornaments of any church in Christendom.

The ambiguous features and feeble condition of Irish Independency may be ascribed to many causes: to the "catholicity" of our missions, the poverty of our ministers, and the time-serving caution or political servility of our people, yielding passively to the overwhelming pressure of the church party, backed by the landlords and gentry. Another cause may be found in our mistaken policy regarding the formation of churches. A few persons, mostly women, headed by some ambitious or crotchety gentleman or *lady*, have been *prematurely* constituted (or rather called by courtesy) a church, and then they have speedily assumed the absolute power of an independent democracy. But the male or female leader, having every means of wealth, influence, and contention, kept the rest in subjection, and made it the grand object of their existence *to rule the minister*; or, if he would not be ruled, to have him removed, to make room for one more pliant and manageable. Unhappily, this was not difficult, as some of our men were educated in the principles of passive obedience, and too often sacrificed their rights to their peace; while committees, whether in Dublin or London (for there was no difference in this), gave too ready an ear to tittle-tattle and complaint. How could our ministers evince manly independence in such a state of things? How could they be respected by other bodies, even if a due regard had been paid to their qualifications as candidates, which was not always the case?

It was from a praiseworthy regard to the liberties and privileges of a Christian church, however feeble and eleemosynary, that the *Irish Evangelical Society* allowed its agents, in so many cases, to merge the missionary in the pastor; and not only to waste their energies on little companies of sanctimonious malcontents thrown into juxtaposition,—misnamed fellowship,—but to have their peace marred, their office lowered, their ministry frustrated, by a petty vulgar despotism ludicrously aping the style and authority of a church.*

* Severe as these remarks may seem to be, yet we fear that circumstances have occurred to justify them. Sufficient attention has not been paid to the necessary distinction between a missionary station and an Independent church. How can a society be truly independent, which derives its support from an extraneous source?

These evils are now to a great extent corrected; the people are learning their duties, and their pastors are, by association with one another, acquiring self-respect. But, still, there is a great want. Ireland is a most difficult missionary field. Intelligent and skilful antagonists meet us at every step. We must be well informed as to our own principles *at least*. I therefore beg earnestly to urge, that the directors of our missionary societies would take measures to have all their agents supplied, both here and in England, with our most indispensable denominational publications. Let inquiries be made as to the extent of this destitution among our ministers; and if poverty be pleaded as an excuse for total ignorance of all that is said and done, and written by the Congregationalists of Britain, and the friends of missions and philanthropy throughout the world, let some plan be at once adopted to remedy the evil. An ignorant pastor makes an ignorant people. Think of a Roman Catholic propagandist profoundly unacquainted with the current publications and proceedings of his own church! There is no such thing to be found. We want piety; but we cannot do without zeal and intelligence. How *familiar* to the congregation must be the *ideas* of a preacher, who never troubled himself with half-a-dozen new volumes since his tutors laid hands on his reverend head—a period of, perhaps, fifteen or twenty years. How “stale, flat, and unprofitable,” must be such discourses, which people of education will attend, if they attend at all, more for example than edification!

Is it not a lamentable thing, Sir, that *we* have not a single organ of any kind to make known our sentiments, not even a penny sheet, to let the world know that we are alive? and this, too, among a *reading* people, who will go a great distance to borrow anything in the shape of a newspaper! But I am happy that a brighter day, a new era, seems to dawn on our cause in Ireland. Our men must be up, reading, thinking, and doing, or else others will run over them, and leave them behind. Let them be stimulated and aided to make the most of their abilities and circumstances; and I hope we shall soon reach a far higher standard of ministerial efficiency and adaptation. But we cannot have a proper public spirit without a *periodical*.

I have the honour to remain, yours very truly,

AN IRISH INDEPENDENT.

Besides, the theory of Independent church government presupposes that the people who are to administer it, have an intelligent acquaintance with the New Testament, the statute book of the kingdom, and are possessed of the graces of the Holy Spirit, to apply its enactments. Recent converts are not equal to honourable self-government, and they had much better be associated with the nearest church, though it be at a great distance, and have ordinances administered to them on the ground of that connexion, than be left in their ignorance and weakness to burlesque a system which, when efficiently administered, is decent, orderly, and edifying.—EDITOR.

CHRISTMAS PARTIES.

WINTER is the season for home enjoyments. The tide of living being, which poured through the length and breadth of the land, has rolled back again to its source: the bright sunny days of summer are gone; and with them are gone all the excursions, and trips, and gipsyings of the pleasurable months of the year: the watering-places are deserted, the quiet nooks, in which the citizen rusticated, are solitary, and the country looks stripped both of beauty and life: but man, the thoughtful and intelligent creature, finds new modes of passing his time; and when shut out from the beautiful scenery of nature, if his habits are domestic, he enjoys his long evenings in the society of home. The blazing fire, the happy family, the book of the day, the new periodical, the lively interchange of opinion, all furnish a pleasant evening, and are more than a recompense for a want of the wanderings of a summer month.

There is a period in the winter season which is especially characterised by social parties, and which gives the colouring to this time of life, as rambling does to the summer. Christmas is the gathering time of relatives and friends. It is with the world a thorough merry-making time. But ought it to be such with the Christian? Whether Christmas is right or wrong; whether the descendants of the good old Nonconformists ought or ought not to keep this day, we do not pause to inquire. Constituted as society now is, they cannot but be involved in the circumstances of the age and country in which they live; and it is for them, therefore, to be careful, if they keep this festive season, that the parties should be such as become those "professing godliness."

The *family party* is one of the most delightful which assembles on these occasions. The ancient sire, with his children and children's children around him, enjoying a green old age, sitting and recounting to them "the way in which the Lord has led him," is a sight enchanting beyond description. How refreshing to hear him tell of his childhood, and boyhood, and youth; his entrance on the great ocean of life, and the providence which formed his connexions, furnished his business, built him up into a family, supplied his wants, and permitted him to see the third and fourth generations; while many of his youthful contemporaries have "dropped off like the leaves in autumn;" and that, in addition to this, God has given him the riches of grace, and enabled him to live to his glory, is a thing which thrills through the feelings, and does good to the soul. This, too, is heightened when a numerous family meet, and the greater number are partakers of the fellowship of the saints; the Christian family party is, in such a case, a delightful meeting, and a happy close of the fleeting year.

The *social party* is another group, which meets at Christmas. This is not select, as the former, and has none of its attractions. The large parties which are formed at this season are, indeed, not always unexceptionable; and Christians ought to consider seriously whether such parties are consistent with the piety they profess. What a mixture they present! The mere professor of religion, and the true believer, are seated side by side, and often know very little of each other, except that they go to the same place of worship, or may belong to the same religious denomination. This leads to desultory conversation: there is no religious sympathy, and no interchange of thought, beyond the politeness of society, or the business and politics of life, and the evening passes with tediousness and unprofitableness. It sometimes happens in such circles, that there is one of the company that will be heard, and has a favourite topic, and this, perhaps, some business transaction, some city affair, some debate "in the House," or to be "brought into the House" that night, and, saving the last thing, perhaps not an idea advanced worth listening to; while the time passes without benefit. In such a case a good man should put on a bold front, and intersperse a wise and holy remark, that men may not speak as if the world was governed only by a cabinet council, and that Providence had ceased to care for us.

The *social parties* are often very large, a thing which of itself renders it difficult to make them profitable. It sometimes happens, that the pastor of the family is invited; and then, if it be that they are all Christians, upon him is imposed the burdensome task of speaking loud enough to edify twenty persons at once; or else the company is frittered into two or three separate bands, each talking of trifles; and he has to go from one little group to another, to show kindness to all, and say what he can to each. Such parties often leave the mind barren, both intellectually and spiritually. The number is too great to spend the evening profitably; and it is more than probable, that each expected from the visit more than was realised; and all this for the want of that interchange of pure, intelligent thought, which might have been obtained in a smaller party.

There is, too, a great evil in large parties which savours much of the world. They are almost always "*dress parties*." In this silent way the fashion of the world creeps into the private life of the wealthy or the respectable believer. The splendour of the dress and the table, which is sometimes seen, is a sad indication of the vanity of the heart: while, perhaps, in the midst of all this, the godly and the ungodly servants waiting on the company catch some sentences, and wonder at the religion of those about them.

Juvenile parties are a third class, which meet at this season; and who would break them up? who would check the buoyancy of youth?

who would rigidly exact a thing which is unnatural and unsuitable? This ought not to be done, but they should be well regulated. It is to be regretted that many Christian families practise *private dancing*, and the Christmas parties of the young are often of this description. Is it, therefore, a matter of surprise, that the youthful part of the congregations of dissenters become worldly and church-going, when there is so much of the world permitted in their associates and their amusements? But it is often said—Young persons must have their pleasures, and what harm is there in a dance? Without reminding those who ask this, that the first dance we read of was round a golden calf, and produced the anger of God; that the next, through a holy joy, produced a quarrel between the husband and wife; and that another issued in John the Baptist losing his head;—we may say, is there no harm in coming so close to the world, as to create an improper love to it? is there no harm in an amusement which produces undue levity? is there no harm in that which unfits for devotion? If the direct evil could not be pointed out, yet the indirect tendency to draw the heart from God is enough to deter every Christian parent from allowing his children to mingle in such amusements. How can you expect a dancing son to become a member of the church of Christ? How can it be supposed that a daughter who is fond of dancing, will love the sobriety of godliness? If Christmas is to be kept, either by the aged or the young, it should be by a careful avoidance of the spirit and amusements of the world.

There is one thing which frequently attaches to parties of each kind, and that is, the late hours at which they break up. Christians should be circumspect in this matter. How many families are by this very thing deprived of family worship! The servants, except one or two, are retired to rest; the master and mistress return home, and the evening ends without the holy and beneficial close of the day; and, recollect, this is not a solitary thing: that very evening there may be twenty other families, with whom you have met, who are just doing the same thing;—so that the late hours, and the worldly party, or the half worldly, have caused this neglect of family worship in twenty houses. It is a grievous thing. If religion is to flourish in our souls, our families, and our churches, we must have consistent piety: then when Christmas presents us with the long wintry evening, whether we meet the family party or the social party, the cheerful close of the year will be in perfect keeping with the Christianity we profess.

NOËL.

ON DR. PUSEY'S SERMON ON THE EUCHARIST.

IN LETTERS ADDRESSED TO A FRIEND.

LETTER II.

MY DEAR FRIEND,—I resume the subject of my last, in the hope of being able to comprise in this, all that it may be necessary to say.

The tendency to superstition which distinguishes fallen man, is his original religious instinct, perverted and depraved; accordingly it is a very subtle and deeply-seated affection; it manifests itself in a great variety of forms, and is sometimes exceedingly difficult to distinguish from genuine piety. Superstition is not the attribute of weak and feeble minds alone; it possesses, blinds, enslaves the great and powerful, and has again and again been seen, in matters of religion, to reduce otherwise generous and noble natures to a most pitiable condition of imbecility and folly. Nor ought we to be surprised at what superstition does; it is the last resort of the incurable depravity of the human heart; its desperate effort to shake off God, yet seem to serve him; and to induce man, without religion, to believe himself to be eminently devout. And where there is true piety, it often mars it, and makes many an attempt to reign alone.

Of the means by which superstition acquires its power, and accomplishes its ends, a very common one is, to convert the simple into the obscure, and the plain into the mystic; to attach to words, ideas they were never intended to convey: and, by the aid of an active imagination, to invest rites and symbols with an awful and indefinable sanctity. This has been done, I apprehend, to a lamentable degree, with the last supper. Not only have terms never used in the sacred writings, been applied to it; but those terms have received a meaning by which its design is obscured, and its nature destroyed. If you will turn to the sermon, you will find Dr. P. speaking of God's "*two great sacraments*," of "*the sacred subject of the holy Eucharist*;" of "*this great mystery*;" of the "*holy mysteries*;" of the "*mystical communion*;" and "*the mystery of the sacrament*;" of "*the sacrament of the altar*;" and of our "*not daring to approach those holy mysteries until*," &c., Now I beg of you to turn to the accounts of its institution furnished in Matthew xxvi.; Mark xiv.; Luke xxii.: realise the scene—behold the Son of man, with his eleven disciples around him, and hear him uttering the words there recorded; endeavour to divest your own mind, for a moment, of all those impressions which such phrases have given to it, and tell me, is there any similarity in the modes of speaking of it, adopted by Jesus Christ, and by Dr. P.? Where is the altar? where the peculiar mystery? where the awful sacrament? Could you for a moment imagine they were referring to one and the same thing?

But many years afterwards, perhaps thirty, the Apostle Paul describes its institution, its nature, and its design; perhaps *he* supplies what Christ deemed it prudent to omit; and more fully reveals its obscure and hidden properties? (I refer to 1 Cor. xi. 23, et seq.) No, *he* uses no such terms, *his* language conveys no such ideas; he seems to have imbibed the mind, and caught the very spirit of his Master; and instead of throwing around it an air of awful mystery, and investing it with an oppressive dread and terror, he speaks of it as an institution of love; as a simple commemorative rite, intended at the same time to excite our gratitude to the Lord Jesus for bearing our sins in his own body on the tree; and to confirm our faith in his promise to come "a second time without sin unto salvation."

You, my dear friend, are too observant not to know the amazing power of words; and how entirely, though imperceptibly, the application of new words to old things, may change and even reverse our conceptions of those things. And more so in religion than in any other matter, so that a departure from the language of the word of God, will invariably be followed by a perversion of its doctrines. And perhaps no two words could have been selected by the early Christians, more likely than the words *mystery* and *sacrament*, to change men's notions of this simple institution; indeed, we may affirm, that if their use was not warranted by our Lord and his apostles, they *must* have changed them; and, once altered, there is no security against any degree of corruption. The application of the word *mystery* to the Lord's supper, I have no doubt, is of pagan origin. "The heathen," says Orme, "had their mysteries of Ceres, of Proserpine, and of Bacchus; their greater and lesser mysteries, into which only certain classes were initiated; and which were carefully and solemnly guarded from the profane. Fond of imitating their great swelling words of vanity, as well as of adopting their manners, some early Christians applied this phraseology to the Lord's supper. It led to a practice which corresponded with the rites of paganism, rather than with the genius of Christianity, or the nature of the institution . . . and the death of Christ, instead of being shewed forth or declared, came to be observed in secrecy.* Mysteries came to be discovered in *every part* of it, till at last it became the leading imposition of that devoted city whose name is MYSTERY." "So common," says the same writer, "were the terms *mystery* and *sacrament* in the mouths of men, in the first centuries, that they were applied to every thing. Doctrines, precepts, ordinances, petitions, were all full of mysteries and sacraments, till the language of religion became alike absurd and unintelligible."

* When the Pagans objected to the secrecy in which the Christians observed this institution, Tertullian justified it, saying, "That it was the very nature of mysteries to be concealed, as those of Ceres (!!) were in Samothracia."—Apologet. vii. c. p. 8.

To the injurious effect produced by the use of *these* words, must be added that which resulted from calling the Lord's supper an *OBOLATION* or *SACRIFICE*. You may easily trace the progress of corruption. A *sacrifice* supposes a *priest*; and the ministers of religion were called priests. A priest and a sacrifice want the altar; and the Lord's table is converted into an altar. But bread and wine are not, after all, a proper sacrifice; and the priest, therefore, uses the mysterious words, "this is my body," as consecrating words: and the bread and wine, to an active imaginative mind, became at once a sacrifice, being transmuted into the very body and blood of the Lord, and were afterwards actually called an *unbloody sacrifice*. Now the great and only satisfactory warrant for all this, namely, scriptural authority, is wanting—the New Testament not so much as *hinting* these views of the Lord's supper. I therefore reject them. At the same time, I am at no great loss to account for their prevalence. Men have been accustomed to call the Lord's supper by these names; the views and impressions conveyed by such names, were conveyed from their very infancy; and prior to all reflection on their part, they are prejudiced in their favour by the worst kind of prejudice, the prejudice of a deep superstition; and apart from that, they have never contemplated the majestically simple representation of the Scriptures. Moreover, besides the fact that man is naturally predisposed to the love of the marvellous and obscure, this superstition is the superstition of devout minds; superstition connected with the *TRUE RELIGION*, which is always the *most inveterate*. Instead of coming to the lively oracles, which we *know* to be divinely inspired, to receive their impressions, they interpret Scripture to harmonise with impressions already received, and easily make it speak the sentimental or mystical language, so fascinating and grateful to a mind that is morbidly devout. Whether I have expressed myself intelligibly I know not; but I think I have somewhat of a natural sympathy with the parties to whom I refer; and so clearly do I seem to myself, to apprehend the processes through which they pass, as to leave little doubt, that had I been educated in their school, and been early accustomed to look at the Lord's supper as an awful mystery, and a dread and holy sacrament, I might, now, have been one of their disciples. As it is, I bless God that I was preserved from a temptation so potent, and rejoice in the simpler view I take, because I believe it to be in harmony with the mind of Christ.

We shall not, however, see how the doctrine of sacramental power came so easily to prevail, unless we take into account the state of the popular mind on the subject of secret influences. The belief in magic was all but universal; no one doubted that there was such a thing as witchcraft and sorcery; and the gains of multitudes, like those of the damsel possessed of a spirit of divination, were derived from the use of incantations and charms. Now the *Bible has a doctrine of secret*

influence; the Old Testament taught, and the New still teaches, that every heart that is renewed and sanctified, is renewed and sanctified by a power we cannot see or feel,—a power divine. It is a great fundamental doctrine of all religion. The Bible, however, connects the exertion of that power with the truth; but it is by no means difficult to see, how minds impregnated with the popular notions, and familiar with the rites of paganism, and the ceremonies of the sorcerer, should be led to put the only two symbolic ordinances of the Gospel in their place; invest them with an *opus operatum* power; and suppose that God's institutions were exalted thereby.

As an additional argument against the sacramental view of the Tractarians, suffer me to remind you, that the principle which it involves would have been entirely new to the disciples, as well as to the Jews generally. Assuredly, the analogy of the institutions of Judaism, would never have taught us to expect in the rites of the New Testament, the mysterious efficacy, the saving power, now so commonly ascribed to them. That it belonged to circumcision, or to the passover,—its two principal observances of this kind,—certainly cannot be supposed. Of the former, we find the apostle saying distinctly, Neither circumcision nor uncircumcision availeth *ANY* thing; and can it be imagined, that if baptism had been anything beyond a rite of *like kind*, that if it had been a *regenerating* ordinance, Christ would have refrained from baptizing; or that Paul would have set preaching so far above it, as to rejoice that he was not sent to *baptize*, but to *preach the Gospel*? Yet there were some who thus perverted the rites of Judaism, and imagined, that to be of Abraham's seed, and to observe the ceremonial institutions of Moses, constituted them children at once of Israel and of God. Were they correct in this? Turn to the first chapter of Isaiah, and the striking fact will at once meet your eye, that God, *on this account*, and on this alone, declares of *his own appointed rites*, that his very soul *abhorred* them. I ask first, then, whether, seeing that under the former dispensation, there were no rites possessing sacramental power, whilst yet the rites which had no such power, were so perverted to the ruin of souls,—it is at all likely, that rites, *with such power*, should be introduced into the better covenant? I ask again whether, if such a change in the nature of rites was intended to be made, it would not have been indicated by Christ or his apostles, in a manner not to be mistaken? Yes, Judaism is against the doctrine; the Christianity of the New Testament is against it; the practice of the apostles is against it. If the rites of the New Testament have an *opus operatum* virtue, their administration ought to have been the *chief* business of these holy men; and by not attending to it thus, Paul especially, and above any other man, is stained with the blood of souls. But we revolt from such a conclusion, and have no alternative left, but to say, that the doctrine is not of God, but of men.

The next point to which I wish to call your attention, is Dr. Pusey's argument drawn from the 6th of John, in favour of the transmutation of the elements. The substance of the argument is this;—"Jesus Christ proclaimed himself the bread of life, declaring that his flesh and blood were that bread; he thus explicitly tells his disciples, 'Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you;' it is, therefore, in the Lord's supper, that this action is performed, and this life communicated." We have two remarks to make on this reasoning. 1st, it requires us to suppose that the terms bread, flesh, and blood, as used by our Lord, are used in a literal, not figurative sense. 2ndly, it assumes that the passage was uttered with an anticipated reference to the institution of the Lord's supper. Both of which we deny. I think it must at once be obvious to you, that if these are metaphorical expressions—that if the idea which Christ intended to convey was this, that what bread is to the body of man, *that his doctrine* is, to man as a sinful creature; the oblation which he was about to offer in his flesh, the atonement he was about to make by the shedding of his blood, would be to his soul, procuring for it deliverance from condemnation, spiritual and eternal life; and that, just as the one must be eaten to give nourishment; so must the other be BELIEVED, THOROUGHLY AND HEARTILY BELIEVED, in order to quicken and sanctify;—I say, if this were his meaning, the passage signally fails to afford any support to the Dr.'s views of the evangelic institution.

I cannot think it necessary to enter on any lengthened argument to show, that Christ *is* here using the language of metaphor, in which he commonly spake. To understand it otherwise, is surely a violation of every just principle of exegesis. I can neither comprehend the order of mind, nor imagine what that perverted faculty can be, that would take it literally; and I venture to say, that there is *no* other passage in the Bible except this, and those which relate to the institution of the supper, in the exposition of which Dr. Pusey himself would so set at nought the laws of right interpretation. Give a man several of the Psalms, or prophecies, or almost any of the parables of our Lord, and allow him such a rule, or, rather, such a liberty of exegesis; and he may make anything and everything of the word of God. The most elementary writer on tropes and figures would teach him better; the unsophisticated common sense of the wayfaring man would rebuke him.

Look, my dear friend, at the case. Our Lord was in the habit of founding his instructions on objects that struck his eye at the moment. He walked through a corn field; he saw a flock of sheep with their shepherd; he beheld a barren fig-tree, or a vine clustering with grapes; and they suggested lessons of Divine wisdom which he at once conveyed. On this occasion, the multitudes who had recently

partaken of his miraculous bounty, gathered around him, not because they believed him, but they desired again to be filled. After rebuking their spirit, and exhorting them to labour rather for the meat which endureth unto everlasting life; he takes this occasion, in a most beautiful manner, to set *himself* before them as "*the bread of life*;" of which he says, "If any man eat, he shall live for ever."—ver. 51. But surely, so far, there can be *no* mistake. The Jews were in no danger of imagining that he was literally bread, to be literally eaten. Had they been so obtuse, the 35th verse must have set them right; where the nature of this eating is thus explained: "He that COMETH to me, shall never hunger; and he that BELIEVETH on me, shall never thirst." But Jesus now changes the figure, and at the close of verse 51 says, "And the bread which I will give is MY FLESH, which I will give for the life of the world;" and tells the Jews, that in the same way in which it was necessary for them to eat the *bread of life*, they must eat and drink that flesh and blood, that also giveth life. Hitherto he had said nothing either mysterious or offensive to the Jews, except in representing *himself*, the *son of Joseph*, as the bread that came down from heaven; beyond this, there is nothing in his discourse that appears to have been unintelligible. But suddenly, they appear to have been placed in a dilemma, like that of Dr. Pusey, and fail to apprehend both the scope and meaning of the remainder of the discourse. And yet we imagine, that the eating and drinking *now* spoken of, are precisely the same kind of eating and drinking as that already described; whilst the new metaphor is intended to present the same truths as the former, in another aspect, and with additional light.

The first metaphor conveyed a most interesting idea; and taught the Jews, that the nourishment of the life of the soul was derived from Christ; but their gracious Teacher wished to impart another lesson of equal, yea, of prior importance; they must *have* life before they could receive the nourishment of life. They were dead—legally dead; under sentence of condemnation. How was this sentence of death, that stood recorded against them, to be removed? in other words, how were they to be pardoned, and justified, and made to live before God? It is to this branch of the subject that the latter part of the discourse refers. *It is an enunciation of the doctrine of atonement*, which was to be effected by giving his flesh and shedding his blood. The apostle Peter represents it in the same way: "Who his own self bare our sins in *his own body* on the tree. . . . being put to death in the *flesh*, but quickened by the Spirit." So Paul: "And you. . . . hath he reconciled in the body of his *flesh* through death." What is the amount of these statements? Is it not this—that Christ is our sacrifice, and his death, in *our nature*, the propitiation for

the sins of the world; and he that hath the Son, he that *believeth* in him, hath life? The Redeemer knew, that when he thus spake to the Jews, he should not, perhaps *could not*, be understood; his *death* must take place before men *could* comprehend its nature or design. It was a mystery to the most favoured disciples till after the day of Pentecost. Yet it was necessary that he should foreshow it. This he did at first very obscurely; speaking more and more distinctly as his hour approached; but thereby placing on record a number of statements, which, as soon as the Spirit was poured out, should lose all their darkness and obscurity, and place the fact of his messiahship, and the design of his mission, in their true light. Is not this a correct exposition of this part of the discourse? and if so, may we not say, that thus endeth *whatever is mystical or ineffable* in eating the flesh and drinking the blood of the Son of man?

But why did the Redeemer select such a metaphor? is it not in itself, unless intended to be literally taken, somewhat harsh and obscure? I think that a very satisfactory reason may be assigned; and I have little doubt, that Jesus was anticipating one of the heresies that he foresaw would arise respecting his person. As some would say, "if the Saviour died, he could not be Divine;" so others would say, "he must be Divine to make atonement, but if Divine, he cannot be a real man;" and they did say it; they supposed him to have put on a human *appearance* only; and that his seeming body was but a phantom, worn to facilitate his personal intercourse with his disciples. But it was just as requisite that he should be man, as God; accordingly the apostle Paul says, "Forasmuch then as the children," &c., Heb. ii. 14; hence, *to meet this heresy*, he delivered this discourse; and hence the apostles so frequently speak of *his body, his flesh, his body of flesh*, &c.; and hence all the Saviour means in the passage before us is, *that those great doctrines, founded on the fact of his having suffered really, and in our nature, must be believed, thoroughly and fully believed, incorporated with our very selves by faith, as bread or flesh that is eaten becomes incorporated, to give life and health.* And we thus see a mode of speaking adopted by our Lord, to refute by anticipation, one mystical doctrine of the early church, employed in these last days to support another, not less pernicious and absurd.

And, my friend, does not our Lord himself intimate that this is the true explanation? The Jews murmured, and the disciples said, and not unnaturally said, "This is a hard saying, who can hear it?" The Saviour answered, "What and if ye shall see the Son of man, *after he has given himself for the life of the world, ascend up where he was before?* *perhaps ye will apprehend me then?* It is the spirit, the spiritual truth, that I am now couching under a figure, that quickeneth; as for the flesh, if you take that term literally, that

can profit you nothing ; it is THE WORD that I speak unto you—the great doctrines, which, for the present, I must leave an enigma—that in due time you shall find to be spirit and life.”

We are now prepared, I think, for the conclusion, that this passage has no particular *reference* to the Lord's supper, and was not intended to be the key to any mystical explanation of the statement made by Christ at its institution. On the supposition that it were so indeed, if our exposition of it is correct, it cannot sustain Dr. Pusey's interpretation of the words, “This is my body.” On the contrary, the probability is increased, that if on the one occasion Christ was speaking metaphorically, so was he on the other. But we deny *any* special reference in the one to the other. There is nothing in the *sixth of John* to lead us to suppose, that when he uttered it, the institution was in his thoughts ; no, not a word ; and I imagine, that if that had been the case, there would almost necessarily have been. Neither is there anything in *the institution* to lead us to believe, that *the discourse* was present to his mind when he brake the bread. It is true, that on the one occasion he said, that his disciples must eat his flesh and drink his blood ; and that on the other, he brake bread in their presence, and said, “Take, eat, this is my body ;” but his design in the latter case, is so different from his design in the former, that we verily believe, that if a doctrine had not arisen out of the institution, which required every possible support to secure it from rejection and contempt ; no such connexion between the one and the other would ever have been dreamed of. At least, before we admit it, we must ask and receive a statement of the reasons and arguments which go to establish such connexion ; with which, as far as we are aware, the church has never yet been favoured.

But after all, it is said, the doctrines of sacramental grace must be true, because they were the doctrines of the early church. Those who lived near the times of the apostles, who knew their mind, and who received their traditions from their own lips, or the lips of their disciples, are surely our best guides in matters of this sort. I shall not go into the question of the authority of tradition. I cannot refrain, however,—whilst freely admitting that many of the fathers were men of eminent piety,—from expressing my surprise, that any one who has looked into their writings, can for a moment place that reliance on them, as expositors of doctrine, which it is now so fashionable to repose in them. How can we depend, for example, on writers like Clement of Rome ; or Justin ; the one of whom actually uses the fable of the phoenix to *prove* the doctrine of the resurrection ; whilst the other, though his sincerity is shown by his submitting to martyrdom, is yet weak enough to believe and teach that the apostacy of angels was occasioned by their falling in love with women ? Nor are they more fanciful, or credulous, than others.

But I must content myself with referring you on this subject to Dr. Bennett's work on the "Theology of the Ancient Church," or to the more recent volume from the pen of Mr. Alexander, of Edinburgh, by whom the subject is directly examined.

But while I waive this question, permit me to remind you, that it is by no means clear that the earliest fathers taught this doctrine. Dr. Pusey's favourite authority appears to be Chrysostom; but the sacramental theory, in his day, had had time to be matured; and if it is to be traced to the apostles, or if tradition is to be allowed to have weight, it is necessary to go back to a much earlier period. And strange to say, the subject is not so much as mentioned in the Epistle to Diognetus (undoubtedly the best, if not the earliest, of the epistles of the fathers, though the writer is unknown), nor by Clemens Romanus. Ignatius died about A. D. 112, or 116. He was a disciple of John, and forty years a bishop. But when we compare his writings with those of his venerable master, the puerilities and bombast of his style compel us to exclaim, How is the fine gold changed! Yet Ignatius teaches no such doctrine. In his Epistle to the Ephesians, p. 25, ed. Vos. 1646, he says, "Endeavour, therefore, to come together more frequently to the eucharist of God, and to his glory; for when you frequently assemble for this purpose, the power of Satan is overthrown," &c. Again, p. 29, we read: "Breaking one loaf, which is the medicament (*φάρμακον*) of immortality; the effect of which is, that you should not die (*ἀντίδοτος τοῦ μὴ ἀποθανεῖν*), but live by Christ for ever." Epistle to the Philippians, p. 40: "Be anxious, therefore, to make use of one eucharist; for there is one flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ, and one cup in the communion of his blood, one altar, one bishop," &c. I can find but one other reference to the subject, which occurs in the Epistle to the Romans, p. 60: "I delight not in the food of corruption, nor in the pleasures of this life. I desire the bread of God, which is the flesh of Jesus Christ, who is of the seed of David; and I desire the cup—his blood, which is immortal love." Of Justin Martyr's authority we have already spoken. Irenæus says, "When, therefore, the mixed cup, and the broken bread, perceive the word of God, it becomes* the eucharist of the body and blood of Christ, from which the substance of our flesh is increased and consists. By this, immortality is conferred on our bodies." Clement of Alexandria is, if possible, at least on this subject, more obscure and unintelligible than Dr. Pusey's self; and we do not suppose that any man of sound mind would regard him as an authority. To him, the Tractarians are welcome, inasmuch as if he teaches "transubstantiation of the elements at all, he teaches the transubstantiation also of

* Did this passage suggest the maxim of Augustine—"Accedit verbum ad elementum, et fit sacramentum?"

the communicants," body, soul, and all! Now the question is, Are these men not speaking figuratively, as our Lord spake in the 6th of John, only with notions somewhat confused, and frequently in bad taste? We believe they are; and that all they mean is, to describe, though in rhetorical language, the spiritual benefits resulting from the commemoration of the death of Christ. And we are confirmed *decidedly* in this view, by the language of other fathers; e.g. Tertullian,* addressing Marcion, writes, "Professus itaque se concupiscentia concupisse edere pascha ut suum acceptum panem, et distributum discipulis, corpus illum suum fecit, hoc est corpus meum dicendo, id est, *figura corporis mei*" (*that is, the figure of my body*). Cyprian says, "Noah drank wine," and "Melchisedec used bread and wine as the *image* of the sacrifice of Christ."† Did their elder brethren intend to say more? But, admitting that one or two may *seem* to say more, do they say it so clearly as to warrant us in building upon their language a doctrine, which is to take the precedence of every other doctrine, and to be exhibited as essential to salvation? Impossible. Yet, if the doctrine of apostles is to be gathered from any fathers, these early ones are the men to teach it. I deny that they teach it. If they did, I could not receive it, unless also taught in the inspired volume; but seeing that they do not, I am compelled at once to reject the teachings of their successors as corruptions of the truth.

Nor did these men themselves ever lay claim to the office of authoritative interpreters of the word of God. The early fathers did not so regard each other; the later did not so look upon the earlier; it is reserved for modern theologians to invest them with this lofty attribute. It is not Barnabas, nor Ignatius; it is not Clement, nor Tertullian; it is Mr. Newman, who lays it down as an axiom, "That when the sense of Scripture, as interpreted by reason, is contrary to the sense given to it by catholic antiquity, we ought to side with the latter."‡ They would have blushed at such language. Even Chrysostom, Dr. Pusey's special friend, says, "Παρακαλῶ καὶ δεόμεναι πάντων ὑμῶν, ἀφέντες τὸ τῷ δεῖναι καὶ τῷ δεῖναι δοκεῖ περὶ τούτων, παρα τῶν γραφῶν ταυτᾶ ἀπάντα πυνθανεσθε."§ "I pray and beseech you all, that dismissing from your minds whatever may be thought of these things by this man and by that, you will examine them all by the Scriptures." I believe this to be a sound principle; I adopt it, and therefore reject the sacramental doctrines.

There is another question that has often pressed on my mind; and which is sufficient, I think, to occasion great perplexity to any man. The opinions I controvert, it is true, are the opinions of Dr. Pusey and his party; but they, at least in modern times, are a *new* party; there

* Tertul. adv. Marc. lib. iv. p. 571.

† Ep. lxiii. p. 149. Ed. 1690.

‡ Romanism and Popular Protestantism, p. 162.

§ Chrys. 2 Cor. Hom. 13.

is another party, in the same church, who take the opposite views, and would assent to the doctrine I advocate. Now what am I to do? which is it that speaks aright? Why should I listen to the former rather than the latter, especially as the heads of the church, almost to a man, are against the latter? If the trumpet give *only* uncertain sound, who shall prepare for the battle? Can you help me out of the dilemma?

But I have no difficulty in deciding, and I confess, that if the balance stood equal before, there is one feature of the character of the Tractarians that would soon turn the scale: I mean, what I *must* call, their narrow-mindedness, their dogmatic, uncharitable spirit; their pretensions, of necessity induce it. In principle, the *only* professed fundamental difference between Rome and Oxford is, that the former obeys the church of the existing age, the latter the church of the earlier ages. In spirit they are one; nor are the indications few, that if the Anglicans could, they would wield the iron sceptre Rome has lost, and pursue the heretic to the death. Let us hear Mr. Newman; he has been recommending an uninquiring faith in the church, and expressing his wish that those who, after what they in their simplicity imagine to be the manner of the apostles, exhort us to "prove all things, and hold fast that which is good," would keep their restless humours to themselves. He goes on to say, "Such troublers of the Christian community would, in a healthy state of things, be silenced or put out of it, as disturbers of the king's peace are restrained in civil matters; but our times, from whatever cause, being times of confusion, we are reduced to the use of argument and disputation,"* &c. Forge again the chain, Sir, furbish the thumbscrew, prepare the gag, bring the axe and the faggot, and in your own person, like Bonner or Gardiner, preside over the sublime and interesting spectacle. Argument and disputation, adieu! you are not proper to rational creatures. Prophets, apostles, martyrs, hail the day,—England is once more submissive to the true catholic faith!! That something like this was the doctrine of James and John in their noviciate, we know; but was it the mind of Christ? It was the remedy of Saul of Tarsus; but did Paul the apostle use it? Yet it is an all but inevitable result of the sacramental scheme, proving that that *cannot* be Divine.

"But these men," it is said, "are undoubtedly men of pre-eminent piety; there is in their spirit a profound reverence for Divine things, in their writings an earnestness and force, and in their lives a pervading sanctity, peculiar to themselves; even if in error, we cannot but admire them, whilst we are almost compelled by these facts, to give heed to what they say, and believe that there must be truth in the doctrines they are aiming to spread." It was my intention to have

* "Romanism and Popular Protestantism," p. 5, Introd.

offered to you some extended observations on this supposed piety, but, anxious to avoid all invidious remark, as well as to bring this letter to a close, I shall merely throw out a few hints to guide your own decisions. I would not be their judge, nor have I any wish to depreciate their religion; I neither fear nor hesitate to avow, that though I regard many of their principles with the deepest aversion and alarm, there are passages in their writings which have afforded me instruction and delight. That they are all destitute of godliness, and that their devotion is entirely spurious, I would not for a moment insinuate. I know a little of that strange compound, the human heart, and am no stranger to the fact, that undoubted sincerity may co-exist with grievous error, and that while the heart is, to some extent, right with God, there may be on particular points, and under peculiar influences, most awful and perplexing manifestations of an evil spirit.

Allowing, then, that they may be good and sincere men, I think that without any violation of the laws of integrity and charity, I am at liberty to suggest some considerations which must enter into a just estimate of the amount and worth of their piety. What is due to such considerations you must judge for yourself. To me, then, their pretensions to superior sanctity would have been less suspicious, *had they been less paraded*. To exhibit them as devout men, certainly no efforts have been spared; and all that writing could do, as well as all that could be done by attention to the externals of religion, has been done, to produce an impression on the public mind, that in the sanctity of their habits, and spirit, and life, no class of men admitted of comparison with them. They would have stood higher in my estimation, however, if, without abating one jot in zeal for what they believe to be truth, their temper had been more modest and unassuming. I fear, again, that they cannot be cleared of *serious charges of unfairness and dishonesty* in controversy. If you will read Mr. Taylor's "Ancient Christianity," or Mr. Good's elaborate volumes, you will find them convicted to a large extent of false and mutilated quotation from the early writers, in support of their views. It is difficult, very difficult to believe, that so much of the *suppressio veri*, &c., made by men who profess an exact and almost exclusive acquaintance with the fathers, can be otherwise than wilful. I scarcely think it is wilful; yet with this concession, dictated by Christian charity, I cannot acquit it of a mental perversion criminally oblique, and of mental prejudice criminally blind; such indeed as seriously affects the character, if not the existence of their piety. Then, *their religion has not yet been tried*. They talk of persecution! but in the name of common sense, what have they suffered? They have before them an object, which, to them, is an object of the highest and holiest ambition,—to bring back the greatest and most religious nation of the world to the true catholic faith; they have already succeeded to such an extent, that they entertain no doubt of a

complete and speedy victory, and already see the day when the nation and the church shall again be one. Their advance has been rapid; and, whilst carrying on their work, their liberties, their property, their life, have been undisturbed and unmolested: they dwell in kings' houses, and bask in the smiles of the wealthy and the noble; they are clothed in purple and fine linen, save when, in voluntary humility, they choose to put on sackcloth, fare sumptuously every day, while a goodly company of virgins follow them. Yet they groan, as if persecuted, and talk of prophesying in sackcloth. Their complaints would be irresistibly comic, if their aberration were not truly mournful. They may still have a measure of sincerity, but I say again they have not been tried. Let them pass through an ordeal like that of the primitive disciples: let them be placed for half a century in the condition of the French protestants, or Nonconformist fathers: let them become a gazing-stock by reproaches and affliction—suffer the spoiling of their goods—endure bonds and imprisonments—and we shall know more about it. We do not wish this: we do not say that it is necessary to make them what they would be thought to be; but till they have stood *some test*, which is calculated to *prove* them, we cannot be called upon to admit, *without some misgiving or reserve*, all their claims to peculiar and pre-eminent sanctity. Then, again, it is in the *nature of great religious error, when acting on certain orders of mind, to produce more powerful visible effects, than sober simple truth*; and the devotee of superstition will often seem more earnestly and profoundly serious than other men: when such error and superstition are also *mystical in their nature*, there is no calculating on the result, because now the imagination is sure to be unduly disturbed and excited. The subjects of its influence become dogmatic, headstrong, severe. The softening, chastening influence of godly fear and jealousy is removed. Salutary doubt gives place to presumptuous confidence. They suppose themselves under the direction of an infallible guide, and are prepared to practise austerities, undergo labours and privations, which others could not sustain, as if urged on by a visible deity; and do deeds, from which others would shrink, under the persuasion that they are fulfilling his will. We are persuaded that there is superstition in the piety of these men; that theirs is, in part, the religion of a morbid imagination, and that they have an idol they know not of: *what it is*, it would be easy to point out. These considerations, then, abate my surprise, and are sufficient to account to me for those features of their character and conduct, in which they differ from others, and which superficial or distant observers regard as the marks, and mistake for the fruits, of an exalted piety.

One question more, and I have done. Is their piety, after all, superior to that of others? "By their fruits ye shall know them." Take their pattern divines, those whom they call the fathers of the

English church, and compare them with the Puritan and Nonconformist fathers. On the one hand you have Bramhall, Andrews, Bilson, Laud, Bull, Cosin, &c. &c.; on the other, Wright, Perkins, Selden, Lightfoot, Cudworth, Pocock, Whichcote, Arrowsmith, Baxter, Clarkson, Bates, Owen, Howe, and others. You may peruse their respective writings, or examine their history for yourself; you may have the testimony of opponents, one of whom, Dr. G. Bates, an eminent royalist, says, "*Moribus severis essent, in concionibus vehementes, precibus et piis officiis prompti, uno verbo, ad cetera boni.*" And I confidently ask, where is the immense superiority in the piety of the former? And does the personal godliness of those who now oppose high-church doctrines, appear to disadvantage by the side of that of the Tractarians? By what are the latter distinguished? I may receive for answer, by their fastings and mortifications, by their devout spirit, and by their earnest zeal. But have they no peers in these graces; and are there no other virtues of the Christian life? I forbear to quote the names of living men for the purpose of eulogy; but if enlightened, manly, humble, elevated piety ever existed, was it not seen in Henry, and Doddridge, and Watts, in Venn and Richmond, in Brainerd and Martyn, in Morrison and Williams, in Hall and Fletcher, in M'All and Roby?

It is a matter, my dear friend, which we can test; the Scriptures have told us what godliness is, and we only want a calm and unprejudiced mind to enable us to judge righteous judgment. If religion consist in crossings and genuflexions, in the observance of fast days and of feast days, in bodily austerities and mental but uninquiring submission to the church, the Tractarians, for aught I know, may be the devoutest of men; but if these, at best, are but the mint and anise and cummin, while the weightier matters of the law are to be sought in profound reverence for the character of God, and in desire to know his will; in humble but stedfast faith in his testimony concerning his Son Jesus Christ,—that faith which worketh by love, which purifies the heart from deceit and hypocrisy, and adorns the character with the graces of the Spirit, produces a holy and spotless life, and renders its possessor spiritual in the world, zealous in the church, patient in tribulation, and peaceful in death;—I say, if this is religion, I envy not the state of that man's mind, who will not discern it in the others, or who hesitates to place such opponents of Tractarianism among the excellent of the earth.

The conclusion, then, at which I arrive, and I think fairly arrive, is this; *That the creed which embraces sacramental grace, does not produce better or holier effects than that which excludes it; that if the doctrine were an essential verity of the Gospel, it is in the highest degree improbable that God would thus uniformly bestow as large measures of Divine influence on men who wilfully and pertinaciously*

reject it, as on those who reverently receive it ; and that, as it is of no real utility, as it is discredited by the history of the Spirit's operations, but above all, as it is not taught in the word of God, and depends for its claim entirely on very dubious expressions of a few fallible and fanciful men ; whilst, if received, it goes to effect an entire change in the very nature of the Gospel ;—I am compelled, alike by prudence, by truth, and by piety, to regard it as a cunningly devised fable, and to adhere to that view of the Lord's supper, which the dictates of common sense, the principles of sound interpretation, and due reverence for the inspired directory of my faith, require me to adopt. Praying that you, my dear friend, may be led into all truth,

I remain, with sincere affection,

Oct. 5th, 1843.

Yours, &c.

MESSIAH, THE ANGEL JEHOVAH.

"Moses was in the church in the wilderness, with the angel which spake to him in Mount Sinai."—Acts vii. 38.

THROUGHOUT the Old Testament we read of the gracious visits of a mysterious Personage, called the angel of Jehovah: all evangelical commentators contend that He was the Son of God, the promised Messiah.

It may be profitable and edifying to contemplate this subject ; reviewing the principal passages of the prophetic Scriptures, in which HE is mentioned, by the help of the light derived from the testimony of the apostles of Christ in the New Testament.

Malachi, in sealing up the inspired oracles of the prophets, foretold the advent of Messiah as the "LORD," the "Messenger," or Angel "of the covenant," Mal. iii. 1. No Christian doubts the application of this to Jesus Christ: and on this prophecy it is remarked by Dr. J. P. Smith: "The MESSIAH is here denominated LORD or SOVEREIGN, by a term in a peculiar form appropriated to signify the Supreme God as the ruler of his visible church, and the possessor of universal dominion. Let it be observed, also, that he is described as the Proprietor and Lord of the temple; and this possession is, in the constant style of the Old Testament, one of the characteristics of Jehovah, the God of Israel. He is called the 'Angel,' or Messenger 'of the covenant,' as his mission was the performance of the covenant of mercy for the salvation of men by a Redeemer; revealed especially to David, and before him to Abraham, and even to Adam; the great promise to which the patriarchs and the pious Israelites ever looked, and which was the ground of their consolation in all their personal and national distresses. With this covenant and promise, the first manifestation of Messiah

was made to fallen man; and with its glad recognition, the testimony of Old Testament prophecy dies."—*Scripture Testimony to Messiah*, vol. i. pp. 442—444.

Moses, when called and commissioned to deliver Israel from Egypt, was favoured with the appearance of this glorious personage, speaking to him as the angel Jehovah: "Now Moses kept the flock of Jethro, the priest of Midian; and he led the flock to the mountain of God, even to Horeb. And the angel of the LORD appeared unto him in a flame of fire out of the midst of a bush. And when the LORD saw that he turned aside to see, God called unto him out of the midst of the bush. Moreover he said, I am the God of thy father, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. And Moses hid his face, for he was afraid to look upon God. And God said unto Moses, I AM THAT I AM: and he said, Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, I AM hath sent me unto you." Exod. iii. 1, 6, 14.

Dr. Hunter, in his eloquent strains, observes, "We find here, as in many other places of the Old Testament, the same person who is styled in the course of the narration, 'The angel of the LORD,' styling himself JEHOVAH and GOD; exercising Divine prerogatives; manifesting Divine perfections, and claiming the homage which is due to deity alone. The person, therefore, thus described, can be none other than the uncreated 'Angel of the covenant,' who, 'at sundry times, and in divers manners,' in maturing the work of redemption, assumed a sensible appearance, and at length, in the fulness of time, united his Divine nature to ours, and dwelt among men, and made them 'to behold his glory, as the glory of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth.'"—*Sacred Biography*, vol. iii. pp. 63, 64.

Adam, even, had been favoured with the appearance of the "angel Jehovah," both before and after his transgression. It is certain that we have no specific or express mention of God being revealed to him in this character or relation, before the fall; but as the Son of God "created all things visible and invisible," Col. i. 16, we believe that "the LORD God, who formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul," Gen. ii. 7, was the angel Jehovah.

Dr. Owen says, "There is frequent mention in the Targumists of the Word of the LORD; and it first occurs in them on the first appearance of a Divine Person after the fall of Adam. The words are, 'They heard the voice of the LORD God walking in the garden in the cool of the day.' The participle *walking* may be as well referred unto the *voice*, as unto the LORD God; and although the original word for voice most commonly signifies an outward voice, or sound thereof, yet when applied unto God, it frequently denotes his almighty power, whereby he effects what he pleaseth. So in Psalm xxix. 3, 9, those things are

ascribed to the voice of the LORD, which elsewhere are assigned to the word of his power. Now all the works of creation and providence, which are assigned to the voice of the LORD, or to the word of his power, are immediately wrought by the essential Word of God, John i. 3; Col. i. 16, which was with God at the creation of all things, as his eternal wisdom and power. This expression, therefore, of the voice of the LORD, may denote the essential Word of God, the person of the Son; for our first parents heard this Word walking, before they heard the sound of any voice or word whatever; for God spake not unto them until after this. And, as after the promise he appeared in a human shape, to instruct the church in the mystery of his future incarnation, and under the name of Angel, to shadow out his office as sent into it and employed in it by the Father, so here, before the promise, he discovered his distinct glorious person, as the eternal voice or word of the Father."—*Exposition of Hebrews*, vol. i. Exercit. x. p. 215.

"Angel" is first mentioned in the narrative regarding Hagar, the handmaid of Sarah, Gen. xvi. 7, 13. But from the terms of that whole record, it seems evident that he was not an ordinary messenger from the court of heaven. To the sorrowful wanderer, "the Angel of the LORD said, I will multiply thy seed exceedingly." Three times besides, the same Divine Person speaks to her under the same name; and, it is added by the inspired historian, that Hagar "called upon the name of the LORD that spake unto her, Thou God seest me." Moses calls this heavenly visitant "JEHOVAH," and Hagar calls him "GOD." He could not, therefore, be other than the Angel of the covenant, who came "in the fulness of time, made of a woman, made under the law," to be our Divine Redeemer.

Abraham "entertained angels unawares," when once three visitants appeared to him in human form, as travellers and strangers, Gen. xix. 1. Two of them were angels indeed, sent on a mission of mercy and of vengeance; in mercy, to "deliver the godly out of temptation," and in vengeance, to execute righteous judgment on guilty Sodom: but the third of these guests of the patriarch, remained with him for a season, repeatedly assuming and receiving the name of JEHOVAH, with the honour due only to God.

Upon this instructive paragraph regarding Abraham, an ancient Jewish commentary says, "The word of Jehovah appeared to him in the valley of vision;" and others explain the distinction of the third personage accompanying the two angels, thus: "The Shekinah was associated with them, and detained Abraham till the angels departed. He said not who he was, but it was the Angel of the covenant."

Abraham's faith having been so wonderfully tried in the offering up of his beloved Isaac, the Divine approbation was expressed with gracious repetitions of former sacred promises; and the angel Jehovah, the Son of God, utters his voice of mercy and grace, in these remark-

able terms: "And the angel of the LORD called unto him out of heaven,—Now I know that thou fearest God, and hast not withheld thy son, thine only son from me. The angel of the LORD called unto Abraham out of heaven the second time, and said, By MYSELF have I sworn, saith the LORD, for because thou hast done this thing, that in blessing I will bless thee, because thou hast obeyed my voice." Gen. xxii. 11, 18.

Jacob was also highly honoured by the visitation of this same Divine Messenger. Hence it is recorded by Moses: "And the angel of God spake unto me,—I am the God of Bethel. And he said, Thy name shall be called no more Jacob, but Israel: for as a prince hast thou power with God. And Jacob called the name of that place Peniel: for I have seen God face to face, and my life is preserved." Gen. xxxi. 11, 13; xxxii. 28—30. Hosea refers to this event in the life of Jacob, and says, "He had power with God; yea, he had power over the angel, and prevailed; he wept and supplicated unto him; he found him in Bethel, and there he spake with us, even the LORD God of hosts; the LORD is his memorial." Hos. xii. 4, 5.

The Patriarch never forgot this mysterious contest; he refers to it in recalling the many deliverances wrought for him through his toilsome pilgrimage, in devout acknowledgments on his death-bed, when visited by his beloved son, who himself had experienced preserving mercies from the same Divine Redeemer. "And Jacob blessed Joseph, and said, God, before whom my fathers Abraham and Isaac did walk, the God who fed me all my life long unto this day, the Angel who redeemed me from all evil, bless the lads; and let my name be named on them, and the name of my fathers, Abraham and Isaac." Gen. xlviii. 15, 16.

Every intelligent reader of the Scriptures will at once perceive, that "the angel who redeemed Jacob from all evil," was no ordinary visitant from heaven, but the great Angel of the covenant, to whom he prayed for spiritual blessings to descend on the youths, his grandsons. Jacob evidently regarded him as the Almighty Deliverer, and the Sovereign Disposer of every blessing.

Moses, in closing his inspired writings, refers to the vision of the Angel of Jehovah, who had appeared to him in Horeb, giving him his commission to deliver Israel; and he speaks of "the good-will of Him that dwelt in the bush," Deut. xxxiii. 16, as the source of all blessings. To the same Divine Person is attributed, in the New Testament, the giving of the law to the Israelites by the ministry of that man of God. Hence Stephen, in his defence before the Jewish Sanhedrim, declares, "This [Moses] is he, that was in the church in the wilderness with the angel who spake to him in mount Sinai." Acts vii. 38.

"And the LORD said unto Moses, Behold, I send an Angel before thee, to keep thee in the way, and to bring thee into the place which

I have prepared. Beware of him, and obey his voice, provoke him not: for he will not pardon your transgressions: for MY NAME is in him." Exod. xxiii. 20, 21. This Name of God, in the idiom of the Old Testament writers, is acknowledged to denote a Divine person, one equal with God; so that the presence of this angel must have been the presence of the Son of God.

Joshua was visited by the same mysterious personage, on his succeeding Moses, as the leader of Israel; and though he appeared in human form, he styled himself "Captain of the host of the LORD," and required the same tokens of adoration and Divine worship, which the Angel of Jehovah prescribed to be observed by Moses at the bush of Horeb. Joshua v. 13, 15.

Manoah, the father of Samson, was favoured with a visit from this Divine Person, foretelling the birth and character of his extraordinary son. For a time "Manoah knew not that he was an angel of the LORD. And Manoah said unto the angel of the LORD, What is thy name, that when thy sayings come to pass we may do thee honour? And the angel of the LORD said unto him, Why askest thou thus after my name, seeing it is secret? Then Manoah knew that he was an angel of the LORD. And Manoah said unto his wife, We shall surely die, because we have seen God. But his wife said unto him, If the LORD were pleased to kill us—he would not have showed us all these things." Judg. xiii. 16—23. This was regarded not only as an extraordinary appearance, but as a visible revelation of the Divine Majesty; and it is plain that though called "an angel" by the historian, he was regarded and worshipped as a Divine person.

Isaiah, in referring to "the loving-kindness of the LORD" shown to Israel by the "Angel of Jehovah," says, "So He was their Saviour. In all their afflictions he was afflicted, and the Angel of his presence saved them: in his love and in his pity he redeemed them; and he bare them, and carried them all the days of old. But they rebelled and vexed his Holy Spirit." lxiii. 8—10. "The combination of the term *Angel of his presence*," says Dr. Henderson, *in loco*, "is not intended to convey the idea of an angel accustomed to stand in the Divine presence, but the Messenger in and through whose person the Deity was manifested to ancient Israel;—the Divine personal Representative. Comp. Exod. xxiii. 20—23, xxxiii. 14, 15, in which latter passage *face* or *presence* by itself is obviously used in the highest personal sense."

Zechariah, in many passages of his prophetic book [i. 8—13; ii. 8—11; iii. 1—10; vi. 12—15] describes a glorious Person as intimately acquainted with the counsels of the Most High; as presiding over the affairs of the world; as directing the ministrations of superior intelligences; as protecting, vindicating, and interceding for the oppressed Jewish church, and Joshua its high-priest; as judging and

triumphing over their enemies; as *sent* by the Lord of hosts; and, therefore, repeatedly called JEHOVAH. These passages reveal the great "Angel" or "Messenger of Jehovah," and describe, in appropriate characteristics, the Messiah, the Saviour, the Priest upon his throne, the Intercessor; and no less clearly describe him as possessing the attributes, exercising the sovereignty, and wearing the holy and incommunicable name of Jehovah.

Dr. Owen has quoted from the works of Rabbi Moses bar Nachman, who wrote in Spain about the year of our Lord 1220, and died at Jerusalem 1260, the following passage, in which he grants that the angel spoken of was God, and yet, being sent of God as his angel, must be a distinct person in the Deity: an important concession from one of the chief masters of the Jews.

"This Angel, if we may speak exactly, is the Angel the Redeemer, concerning whom it is written, 'My name is in Him.' Exod. xxiii. 21. That Angel who said to Jacob, 'I am the God of Bethel.' Gen. xxxi. 13. He of whom it is said, 'And God called unto Moses out of the bush.' Exod. iii. 4. And He is called an Angel, because He governeth the world. For it is written, Deut. vi. 21, 'The Lord our God brought us out of Egypt;' and Num. xx. 6, 'He sent his Angel and brought us out of Egypt.' Moreover it is written, Isa. lxiii. 9, 'And the Angel of his face (presence) saved them;' namely, that Angel who is the face of God; of whom it is said, Exod. xxxiii. 14, 'My face shall go before thee, and I will cause thee to rest.' Lastly, it is that Angel of whom the prophet speaks, Mal. iii. 1, 'And the Lord whom ye seek shall suddenly come unto his temple, the Angel of the covenant, whom ye delight in.' Mark diligently what is the meaning of those words, 'My face shall go before thee.' For Moses and the Israelites always desired the highest Angel; but who that was, they could not truly understand. For neither could they learn it of any others, nor obtain it by prophecy. But the face of God signifies God himself, as all interpreters acknowledge. But no man can have the least knowledge hereof, unless he is skilled in the mysteries of the law. 'My face shall go before thee, that is, the Angel of the covenant, whom ye desire; in whom my face shall be seen;' of whom it is said, 'In an acceptable time have I heard thee; my name is in Him; I will cause thee to rest;' or cause that he shall be gentle or kind unto thee, nor shall lead thee with rigour, but quietly and mercifully."—*Dr. Owen on the Hebrews*, vol. i. p. 230.

"The person described," Dr. J. P. Smith remarks, "claims an uncontrolled sovereignty over the affairs of men: He has the attribute of omniscience and omnipresence:—He performs works which only omnipotence could:—He uses the awful formula by which the Deity, on various occasions, condescended to confirm the faith

of those to whom the primitive revelations were given; He 'swear-eth BY HIMSELF:' He is the gracious Protector and Saviour, the Redeemer from evil, the Intercessor, and the Author of the most desirable blessings;—His favour is to be sought with the deepest solicitude, as that which is of the highest importance to the interests of men;—He is the object of religious invocation;—He is, in the most express manner, and repeatedly, declared to be JEHOVAH, God, the ineffable 'I AM THAT I AM:'—Yet this mysterious Person is represented as distinct from God, and acting (as the term *Angel* imports) under a Divine mission!"—*Scripture Testimony*, vol. i. p. 454.

The testimonies of the early fathers of the Christian church, as quoted by the excellent David Simpson in his "Plea for the Deity of Jesus," are in harmony with these interpretations.

"1. Justin Martyr hath delivered his sentiments very freely upon the Divine appearances. Our Christ,' he says, 'conversed with Moses out of the bush, in the appearance of fire.—And Moses received great strength from Christ, who spake to him in the appearance of fire.' Again:—'The Jews are justly reprov'd, for imagining that the Father of all things spake to Moses, when indeed it was the Son of God, who is called the Angel and the Messenger of the Father. He formerly appeared in the form of fire, and without a human shape, to Moses and the other prophets: but now—being made a man of the Virgin,' &c.

"2. Irenæus says: 'The Scripture is full of the Son of God's appearing, sometimes to talk and eat with Abraham; at other times to instruct Noah about the measures of the ark; at another time to seek Adam; at another time to bring down judgment upon Sodom; then again to direct Jacob in the way; and again, to converse with Moses out of the bush.'

"3. Tertullian is still more explicit: 'It was the SON who judged men from the beginning, destroying that lofty tower, and confounding their languages; punishing the whole world with a flood of waters; and raining fire and brimstone upon Sodom and Gomorrah, the Lord pouring it down from the Lord:—for he always descended to hold converse with men, from Adam even to the patriarchs and prophets, in visions, in dreams, in mirrors, in dark sentences, always preparing his way from the beginning:—neither was it possible, that the God who conversed with men upon earth, could be any other than that Word, which was to be made flesh.'

"4. Origen says, 'My Lord Jesus Christ descended to the earth more than once. He came down to Esaias, to Moses, and to every one of the prophets.'—Again: 'That our blessed Saviour did sometimes become as an angel, we may be induced to believe, if we consider the appearances and speeches of angels, who in some texts, have said, *I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac,*' &c."

Believing these statements to be "the true words of God," with what delight may we join in the Christian song—

" Arrayed in mortal flesh,
He like an angel stands ;
And holds the promises
And pardons in his hands :
Commissioned from his Father's throne
To make his grace to mortals known !"

G.

ON THE PERMANENCE OF THE DECALOGUE.

REPLY BY W. S. TO THE REMARKS OF I. J.

THE author of the following observations, conscious that he has already encroached too far on the pages of the *Congregational Magazine*, as well as on the patience of its readers, had intended to abstain from all further discussion of the subject to which they refer ; but, in consequence of the recent remarks of I. J. on the permanence of the decalogue,* thinks himself in justice bound to offer a brief reply to the arguments of his respected opponent, which will at the same time form the conclusion of his own. On two important subjects in theology,—the decalogue and the Christian Sabbath,—different opinions have been proposed for consideration. By one party the decalogue is regarded as a perfect summary, or statutory enactment of the moral law ; by the other as a distinct code, containing indeed much of the moral law, but of far more limited extent ; having been introduced for a special purpose, namely, to serve as the basis of the Mosaic covenant. In like manner, the Christian Sabbath is by one party supposed to be comprehended in the decalogue, and in the moral law ; by the other party, as not included in either of those codes, and as deriving its authority, not from divine command, but from human consent. On fundamental and practical points there is happily no difference of opinion, so that the controversy may be carried on without animosity, or apprehension ; its interest chiefly depending on its relation to the harmony of revealed truth, and the principles of scriptural interpretation.

The design of the following inquiry is to ascertain how far the views of I. J. and W. S. differ or agree, and which of them seems to be the most correct. This comparison is much facilitated by the able, and for the most part temperate manner in which the discussion has been conducted by I. J., and by his perspicuous distribution of its leading topics under three heads or propositions, which he undertakes to

* In the *Congregational Magazine* for November, 1843, pp. 793—803.

defend, namely: 1st. That all the precepts of the decalogue are essentially moral (as opposed to positive) precepts; 2nd. That the decalogue contains the substance of the whole moral law; and, 3rd. That the decalogue is recognised in Scripture as being of permanent obligation.

In reference to the first proposition,—“That all the precepts of the decalogue are moral precepts,”—the only point in dispute relates to the Sabbath, and on this I. J. seems now disposed to make some concession, for he says:—“Who will deny that social or public worship is a duty involved in the moral law, or that it is equally, and in like manner, the duty of man to set apart a portion of his time for such worship? The *particular* day, whether first, or seventh, or any other, may vary: it does not enter into the essence of the precept; it is positive. But we must not confound, as W. S. does, the *particular* day with the *principle* of the law; or, as it is said in a former article, we must distinguish between the precept and the language in which it is clothed. The consecration of a stated portion of our time to the public worship of Jehovah is as obligatory upon us as any other duty. . . . All that we need to know is, *what* day we are to observe. The slightest indication of this is sufficient. The seventh day was pointed out to the Jews. The first day is indicated to us, while we are plainly told that the Jewish sabbaths are abolished.”—To this argument W. S. replies, that the consecration of the seventh day of the week, in regular succession from the creation of the world, seems to him to be the sole and entire object of the fourth commandment;—an object defined in such rigorous terms, and accompanied with such specific explanations, that the notion of any other weekly sabbath, and consequently of any general sabbatical principle of divine authority under that code, is absolutely excluded. In proof of this, let the commandment be again carefully read.—“Remember the Sabbath-day to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labour, and do all thy work, but the seventh day *is* the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; *in it* thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy manservant, nor thy maid-servant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that *is* within thy gates; for *in* six days the Lord made heaven, and earth, the sea, and all that in them *is*, and rested the seventh day; wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath-day, and hallowed it.”*—I. J. admits that the appointment of a particular day for such purpose, whether the first, or seventh, or any other, is positive, and that the Jewish Sabbaths are abolished. Then it necessarily follows that the fourth commandment, which appoints a particular day, the seventh day of the week, to be the Jewish Sabbath, includes a positive and mutable precept, and so far at least cannot form a part of the moral law,

* Exodus xx. 8—11.

which is essentially immutable and eternal. I. J. affirms that the observance of the Lord's-day rests on the sabbatical principle as its basis; but if, whilst the Jewish Sabbath is abolished, no such sabbatical principle is to be found in the Scripture, and no new commandment on the subject has been given, the observance of the Lord's-day, however deserving of imitation, as an ancient and laudable custom, cannot be deduced from the decalogue, nor regarded as of divine institution. Neither the name, nor the single mention of the Lord's-day at the close of the New Testament,* proves that the entire day was observed by divine command, in the room, and after the manner of the seventh-day Sabbath, which, during that period, was still binding on Jewish Christians; whilst of Gentile Christians the apostle Paul expressly declares that those who did, and those who did not thus distinguish one day above another, might be equally conscientious, and equally acceptable to God.† It is further maintained by I. J., that—"the consecration of a stated portion of our time to the public worship of Jehovah is as obligatory upon us as any other duty;" that, on account of its inculcating this duty, "the fourth commandment is as truly moral as any of the rest; and that any code professing, or set forth to be the moral law, and which would omit the *substance* of this commandment, would be *essentially defective*."—But, if this is the case, the decalogue is thus defective, for the fourth commandment says not a word respecting public worship, and the account given of the first Sabbaths observed by the people of Israel is adverse to such a supposition, the divine order given to them having been,—“Abide ye every man in his place: let no man go out of his place on the seventh day;”‡ so that, as far as appears from the Scripture, they kept the Sabbath at that time in a very private and domestic manner. On the other hand, the moral law certainly inculcates the practice of social, as well as of private devotion, but leaves the seasons of both to be settled by common consent. For such purposes there is no natural reason for preferring one season to another, nor for the perpetual consecration of entire, or particular days. In different times and places such seasons may be varied without inconvenience or offence; but, whenever by common consent they are fixed, as for example in the case of the Lord's-day, it becomes a real, although a secondary duty, on that very ground, to respect and observe them. The result of inquiry under the first head is that, according to I. J.'s own showing, the fourth commandment is redundant by admitting a positive precept, and defective by omitting to enjoin public worship; and therefore, that for this as well as for other reasons, the decalogue, however excellent, and admirably adapted for its own proper purpose, cannot be regarded as identical with the moral law.

* Revelation i. 10.

† Romans xiv. 1—6.

‡ Exodus xvi. 27—30.

In reference to the second proposition,—“That the decalogue contains the substance of the whole moral law,”—I. J. likewise makes a concession in the following terms.—“I say the *substance*, for it has never been regarded as a full exposition or developement of that law. I know of no duty which it does not *express*, or *imply*. Of course, in considering it, we must (guided by correct laws of exposition,) have regard to the *principle* rather than the *letter* of each precept. . . . We must expound the decalogue as we would any other portion of the sacred volume, bringing to bear upon it the usual legitimate canons of biblical interpretation.”—A remark previously offered may here be repeated; namely, that the use made by I. J. and others of the terms “letter and spirit,” differs from that which occurs in the New Testament, where they always signify the law and the gospel,—or the declaration of the divine commands in writing, and the principle of evangelical obedience implanted by the Holy Spirit in the heart, by means of which Christians are emphatically said to—“serve in newness of spirit, and not in the oldness of the letter.”—It should also be remembered that the term “law,” is variously applied in the New Testament, so as occasionally to signify the decalogue, the Mosaic covenant, a part or the whole of the Old Testament, any divine rule of conduct, and finally, active power or propensity, whether good or evil. The last of these senses is chiefly employed by the apostle Paul, and corresponds to that which since the time of Lord Bacon has been commonly adopted in works of natural philosophy. A due attention to this diversity is important, as many passages of the New Testament are otherwise liable to be misunderstood.

The method taken by I. J. to prove the completeness of the decalogue, as an epitome of the moral law, is more singular than satisfactory, for it amounts to this,—that the decalogue is a perfect code, provided the reader takes care, by employing “correct laws of exposition, and legitimate canons of biblical interpretation,” to supply its deficiencies. How the reader is to be provided with these laws and canons is not stated; but whether a divine rule of conduct intended for universal use should require such assistance, may be reasonably doubted. Waiving however this difficulty, the representation given is scarcely correct; for whereas it is the character of a good summary to furnish general principles and positive directions, leaving particular applications and negative consequences to be rationally inferred, the decalogue for the most part does just the reverse, and its omissions must be supplied by the moral law, either as more fully expounded in other parts of Scripture, or as originally written on the human heart. Now, if these collateral authorities are capable of supplying the fundamental principles and positive directions of moral duty, they can, of course, still more easily supply its subordinate details and prohibitions; and, had not the decalogue been needed for a different and specific purpose,

might have dispensed with its assistance altogether. The man who, with an ingenuity like that of I. J., is able to deduce from its bare prohibitions all the virtues which can adorn human nature, must certainly be very independent of its instructions. If, however, as W. S. contends, the decalogue was promulgated, not as an epitome of the moral law, but merely as the basis of the Mosaic covenant, it will be better perhaps to take it as it is, without addition or subtraction; and, in this point of view, the statement that a man may perform all its requirements, and yet fall short of moral excellence, will not appear quite so *monstrous*, or *mysterious*, as I. J. seems to suppose. A negative sort of character, deficient in genuine principle, but externally decent and inoffensive, is not only of common occurrence in society, but is often denounced from the Christian pulpit. Such was, in some respects, the character of the apostle Paul before his conversion; for he declares that,—"in reference to the righteousness which is in the law he was blameless," and yet acknowledges that he was at the same time, "the chief of sinners."*—That such is the true nature of the decalogue appears, as before stated, from the language of Christ himself; who, in his sermon on the mountain, does not, as I. J. alleges, expound the decalogue, but improves on it, and, in comparison with the high standard of absolute holiness, which he enforces, designates its precepts as "least commandments," an epithet, which, in whatever way explained, is assuredly somewhat disparaging. His mode of commenting on it is well known:—"Ye have heard that it was said to them of old time, Thou shalt not murder, . . . thou shalt not commit adultery, . . . thou shalt not commit perjury, . . . thou shalt love thy neighbour, and hate thine enemy, . . . an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth, . . . but I say to you," &c.†—Although some of these "least commandments" are not included in the decalogue, they are evidently not opposed by it, since they occur in other parts of the Mosaic law, which cannot of course be inconsistent with itself. For the same reason, neither can polygamy, concubinage, nor an almost unlimited liberty of divorce, be prohibited by that code; and therefore, when Christ reproves such practices, he refers his hearers, not to the decalogue, which would not have answered his purpose, but to the moral law written on the heart, and spontaneously suggested to mankind by the circumstances and relations in which they are placed. On the subject of divorce the Pharisees pleaded the permission of Moses; but Jesus replied,—“Moses, because of the hardness of your hearts, permitted you to put away your wives; but from the beginning it was not so. And I say to you,” &c.‡ In like manner, when asked by them,—"Which is the first of all the commandments?"—he quoted this

* Philip. iii. 4—6; 1 Tim. i. 12—15; 2 Tim. i. 3. † Matt. v. 17—48.

‡ Matt. xix. 3—9.

and the second great commandment, not from the decalogue, but from another part of the Old Testament;—"Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength, . . . and thy neighbour as thyself;" and represented them to be, not as suggested by I. J., "an epitome of the decalogue," but its *foundation*.—"On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets."*—It cannot be supposed that the apostles of Christ held a different language in this respect from their Master; and, were space allowed, it would be easy to show, even without again alluding to the fourth commandment, that, in the passages already cited from their epistles, both Paul and James, whilst paying all proper regard to the decalogue, yet assign a higher place to "the royal law of liberty and love," which fulfils the former by going beyond it.† W. S. has merely followed with humility in the same track; and perhaps, on further consideration, I. J. himself, who has found so much morality in the decalogue, will penetrate the supposed *mystery*; and, finding still more in the two great commandments, will acknowledge that a law which deals chiefly in prohibitions is surpassed in value by one which inculcates positive and fundamental precepts, and enjoins every one to love in just proportion his God, his neighbour, and himself, thereby virtually denouncing every kind and degree of profaneness, inhumanity, and vice. Still more valuable, however, than either of them is that influence of the Holy Spirit which, co-operating with the message of the gospel, actually produces in the human heart the living principle of love to God for his own sake, and consequently of proportional love to all that resembles him,—a principle which insures a cordial and universal obedience to his will, in whatever way that will may be announced, and which would therefore re-discover the moral law in the works of nature and providence, even if all its written codes had perished from the earth.

Under his third proposition, that "the decalogue is of permanent obligation,"—as under the two former ones, I. J. makes concessions tending to reduce and simplify the controversy; which, if longer continued, would probably degenerate into a dispute about terms, depending on a confusion of ideas. These are his words:—"W. S. asserted in a former article that the decalogue had a 'beginning and an end.' This assertion he reiterates; but *now* he explains it as referring to the law considered as 'the basis of the Mosaic covenant.' But this no one ever denied. Moral, or ceremonial, it could be the basis of that covenant only while the covenant itself lasted. But when he says that it is expressly stated in Scripture that it had a 'beginning and an end,' I am totally at issue with him. No such assertion is made in Scripture. In the third chapter of Galatians, the giving of the law as

* Matt. xxii. 34—40.

† Gal. v. 13, 14; James i. 25; ii. 8—12.

the basis of the Mosaic covenant is spoken of as taking place four hundred and thirty years after the Abrahamic covenant ; but that is all. And who ever questioned this ? or, what is it to the point in hand ? Its existence, prior to the Mosaic covenant, is nowhere denied. Every precept of it, as a matter of *fact*, was in existence from the beginning ; not, I will admit, in the same *shape*, but it is the *substance*, rather than the shape, that must chiefly be regarded."—Both parties then agree that the moral law is of supreme and eternal obligation, and that the decalogue was the basis of the Mosaic covenant only, whilst that covenant lasted,—that is, during the period of about fifteen hundred years, from Moses to Christ. The difference between them is, that one party regards the decalogue as a simple and perfect transcript of the moral law ; the other, as a partial extract from that law, better adapted by such limitation, and by the addition of a positive precept,—the institution of the Sabbath,—to be the basis of the national covenant made by God with the people of Israel. The proof of the present proposition depends, therefore, as I. J. has remarked, on that of the two preceding ones, with which it must either stand or fall. That all the precepts of the decalogue, as far as they are moral precepts, existed in another form from the beginning of time, and will continue in force till its termination, is fully admitted ; but this would have been equally the case had the decalogue never been enacted. Its coincidence to this extent does not amount to an absolute identity with the moral law, the authority and permanence of which depend, not on any written code, or arbitrary appointment, but on the actual constitution of the universe. As including a considerable portion of this law, the decalogue is appropriately quoted in several parts of the New Testament, but almost always, as it appears to W. S., with a distinct recognition of the specific character which he has ascribed to it, namely, as the basis of the Mosaic covenant. The principal reason why it is so often cited and discussed in that portion of the sacred volume, has been already mentioned. Before their conversion to Christianity, the members of almost all the primitive Gentile churches seem to have frequented the synagogues of the Jews, and to have become, to a greater or less extent, proselytes to their religion. Long after embracing the gospel, they still retained a strong attachment to the law ; and some of them, more especially those of Galatia, actually proposed to superadd Judaism to their Christianity, a course to which they were continually urged by the Judaizing teachers, who abounded at that period. Many Hebrew Christians, also, had very confused notions of the mutual relation of the two covenants ; which, therefore, for the common instruction of both parties, the apostle Paul was prompted to explain in a very full and perspicuous manner ; although, if one may judge from opinions and practices still prevalent, not sufficiently so to prevent all misconception on the subject.

The Greek and Romish churches have systematically adopted several of the principles of Judaism, and other established churches have more or less followed their example. Hence they make pretensions to priesthood, spiritual influence, and propitiatory sacrifice; and their sacred edifices are furnished with altars, as they are termed, where portraits of Moses and Christ, the one presiding over the decalogue, the other over the Lord's prayer and the Apostles' creed, are placed in juxta-position, as if to intimate that the two covenants are now united. Even protestant nonconformists, residing in countries where such principles prevail, are apt to be infected with similar notions, imbibed when they are young from catechisms, and church or college articles, and sometimes confirmed when they are older, by the practice of speaking or writing in their defence. Under such circumstances an appeal to the Scriptures is of little avail, since almost every one has a propensity to expound them agreeably to his own prejudices and predilections. Thus, on the present occasion, I. J. and W. S. take opposite views of the same texts; and as they cannot be judges in their own cause, their readers must determine for themselves which of the two approaches nearest to the truth. In the mean while each party, unless prepared to prove the contrary, ought to give the other credit for sincerity at least, if not for judgment, on which principle W. S. objects to the admonition offered him by I. J.,—"not to handle the word of God deceitfully,"—since it involves a serious and unfounded imputation, which he trusts his respected opponent will, on further reflection, be disposed to withdraw. Although well aware of his liability to error, W. S. believes that the interpretations which he has proposed are substantially correct, and that the passages which he has quoted really establish the propositions which they are adduced to support. Whilst maintaining on the authority of the apostle Paul that the Gentiles, without a revelation, had by nature sufficient means of knowing the moral law to render their transgression of it inexcusable, and that the people of Israel, with all the advantages of revelation, were not prevented from falling into similar transgression, he nevertheless acknowledges with gratitude the unspeakable value of the Scriptures, as a source of moral and religious instruction; but apprehends that too much importance has in this respect been ascribed to the decalogue, and too little to many other passages, both of the Old and New Testament, which greatly surpass that document in copiousness and force; and not only teach the moral law completely, in all its details, but also recommend it by arguments and motives calculated to render it an object of the highest reverence and affection. An example of this kind is furnished by the concluding paragraph of I. J.'s last communication; where, forgetting apparently the different senses of the term "law," in different parts of Scripture, he applies to his favourite decalogue the well-known and beautiful eulogy on "the law of the Lord," contained in the nineteenth psalm,

in which, as well as in the hundred and nineteenth, it is sufficiently evident from the general tenor of these sacred poems, and from the introduction of the terms—"testimonies, precepts, statutes, judgments," &c.—that the allusion is not to the decalogue merely, but to the entire body of laws connected with the covenant made by God through Moses with the people of Israel, and of which the book of Deuteronomy is a most eloquent and effective summary. It needs only a little further discrimination of the same kind to restore the decalogue to its proper place and office in all other respects, and in so doing, to bring the present controversy to a satisfactory and amicable termination.

London, November, 1843.

W. S.

THE HYMN OF CLEANTHES, ADDRESSED TO JUPITER.

ATTEMPTED FROM THE GREEK.

DR. DODDRIDGE has the following note in his *Family Expositor*, on Acts xvii. 28 :

"These words, 'For we are his offspring,' (which I choose to put in a poetical order, as best imitating the original,) are well known to be found in Aratus, a poet of Cilicia, Paul's own country, who lived almost 300 years before this time. I wonder so few writers should have added that they are, with the alteration of one letter only, to be found in the Hymn of Cleanthes to Jupiter, or the Supreme God, which I willingly mention, as beyond comparison the purest and finest piece of natural religion of its length, which I know in the whole world of pagan antiquity; and which, so far as I can recollect, contains nothing unworthy of a Christian, or I had almost said, of an inspired pen. It is to be found in Hen. Steph. *Poes. Philosoph.* p. 49, et seq., and with Dupont's Latin Translation, in Cudworth's *Intellect. System*, book i. chap. iv. p. 432, 433; and I am sorry I know not where to refer my reader to a good English version of it. The apostle might perhaps refer to Cleanthes, as well as to his countryman Aratus, when he introduces this quotation as what some of their own poets had said."

GREAT Jove, of all th' immortal gods supreme,
By various names ador'd; be thou my theme.
Thou know'st no change, omnipotent art thou;
Before thy everlasting throne I bow.
Nature itself is under thy control,
Thy hand has form'd, supports, and guides the whole.
Man, blest with vocal pow'rs, is taught to raise
His tuneful voice to celebrate thy praise.
We are thy offspring; we, whose heav'nly birth,
More than from aught that lives and creeps on earth,
Demands a grateful song: for man alone,
Of all earth's tenants, can address thy throne.

Thee will I sing; and sing that Pow'r divine,
 By which the sun and stars and planets shine;
 And wheeling round the world, obey thy nod,
 And joyful own an ever-present God.
 Thou guid'st, with steady hand and mighty force,
 The forked lightnings in their fiery course;
 When Nature looks aghast, and trembling stands,
 Waiting in solemn silence, thy commands.
 But thou art wise in all;—when thunders roll
 In awful majesty from pole to pole;
 And when the lamps of night and orb of day
 In order move along their noiseless way,
 All that inhabit heav'n, and earth, and sea,
 Think, speak, and act, as they're impell'd by thee;
 Save when the wicked violate thy laws,
 Their own corrupt desires, the guilty cause.

Thou mak'st the frowning face of Nature smile,
 And crown'st with beauty things deform'd and vile;
 All jarring elements of good and ill,
 Touch'd by thy plastic hand, obey thy will;
 And heav'nly wisdom, great beyond control,
 Into one glorious system forms the whole.

But wretched men, by vice and folly led,
 Who ne'er in search of happiness have sped;
 With ears obstructed and averted eyes,
 Th' eternal *Law of Reason* dare despise:
 Which, had they kept it with obedient will,
 Had bless'd their days, and screen'd their lives from ill.

But, ah! ill-fated men, they onward rush,
 And ev'ry virtuous feeling madly crush.
 Some pant for fame, by wild ambition fir'd,
 Some grasp at wealth, by love of gold inspir'd.
 Others in brutal sloth dream time away;
 And some to pleasures give the night and day;—
 Pleasures of sense, which disappoint and cloy,
 And rob the aching heart of ev'ry joy.

But, mighty Jove, thou bounteous Lord of all,
 Father of gods and men, on thee I call.
 Though clouds and darkness gird thy dazzling throne,
 And by thy voice of thunder thou art known,
 Let thy paternal eye with pity see
 The sons of folly wand'ring far from thee.
 On their benighted eyes thy knowledge pour,
 That they may stray in error's path no more.
 Does heav'nly wisdom o'er the world preside?
 Let the same wisdom all their footsteps guide.

Thus honour'd, we thy nobler honour raise,
 For man was form'd for thy unceasing praise:
 And blest are gods and men, who ever sing
 The *Universal Law* of their eternal King.

A SEPTUAGENARIAN.

REVIEWS.

Baptismal Regeneration opposed, both by the Word of God, and the Standards of the Church of England. By the Rev. Capel Molyneux, B.A., Minister of Trinity Episcopal Chapel, Woolwich. 12mo. London: Seeley & Co.

Lectures on the Baptismal Regeneration Controversy, delivered at Woolwich. By the Rev. Charles Stovel. 12mo. London: Houlston & Stoneman.

THESE two works agree in several particulars. They had their origin in the same town, they refer to the same subject, they resulted from the same efforts to maintain the doctrine of baptismal regeneration; and they both contain a refutation, more or less conclusive, of this superstitious tenet. But they differ greatly in other respects. The former is intended to prove that the church of England does not teach baptismal regeneration; and the latter is designed to show, that Congregational and other Pædo-baptist churches virtually do teach it. The one author stands forward to vindicate the church to which he belongs from a charge which most of its members acknowledge, and in which, indeed, they glory; while the other seeks to criminate his brethren of other Christian societies, by charging them with errors and practices which they have uniformly, both by word and deed, repudiated and opposed.

It appears that Mr. Molyneux has been very rudely assailed, by some anonymous writers, on the ground of alleged inconsistency, because, being a clergyman of the church of England, he yet opposed the doctrine of baptismal regeneration. In this publication he seeks to show, in the first place, that this doctrine is opposed to the Bible; and, in the second place, that it is also opposed to the doctrinal standards of his church. The first portion of his argument, although not in every respect satisfactory, is yet conclusive; but the second is, we think, entirely the reverse. His reasoning, on this point, may be easily described. He shows that the church of England requires faith as the condition for the baptism of adults; and that, according to its Articles, we are regenerated by faith. Hence he infers, that the Church requires regeneration before baptism, and administers the rite because the blessing denoted by it, is supposed to be already received. This view of adult baptism is then transferred to infant baptism; and we are told that infants are regarded, by the church of England, as believers, as persons possessing faith in Christ, and who are regenerated by faith; and to them, also, baptism is administered as the sign of a regeneration which has already taken place. Now we

cannot but regard this reasoning as very feeble, and the conclusion to which it leads, as little worse than the tenet for which it is substituted. It is not, and we think it cannot be, shown, that the faith which, according to the church of England, is the pre-requisite to baptism, is the faith which secures salvation; nor that the efficacy attributed to faith, is assigned to it apart from the use of sacraments, and other means. But unless both these points were established, the conclusion could not be maintained. And if it were proved, that in one place the church taught that a man is regenerated by faith, this would not show that it did not teach in another place, that he is regenerated by baptism. But, waiving these objections, what is the conclusion which Mr. M. brings forward, as the real doctrine of his church? It is nothing less than this; that infant children brought to the font, possess, before their baptism, saving faith, and are regenerated by their faith. But has it not occurred to Mr. M., that the doctrine which he so strongly condemns, is unscriptural and injurious, not because it refers a blessing which is really enjoyed to an instrumentality which does not produce it, but because it declares that the blessing is possessed where it does not exist, and thus often occasions a fatal delusion. If a man were to imagine that he was regenerated by faith in infancy, he would not be in a better condition, than if he supposed that he was regenerated by baptism in infancy. Mr. M.'s representation secures a kind of doctrinal harmony, which he highly values, but which appears to us absolutely worthless, since it is apparent only, and not real—in words, and not things. And this is its only advantage. Its tendencies, so far as we can see, are precisely the same, if the teaching of the church is believed; and it is even more unreasonable and unscriptural. It not only states that a child is regenerated when there is no evidence of its regeneration, but it also declares that an infant has faith in Christ, when there is no evidence of its faith. And this is styled the judgment of charity! When it is admitted that no evidence of faith can be given—when its existence is inconceivable—when, in the greater number of instances, the subsequent life disproves such statements,—still the church of England, according to Mr. M., does declare, in the judgment of her charity, all infants brought to receive the Christian rite, to be believers—to be regenerated by their faith—and most solemnly gives them baptism, as the sign that they are regenerated! That many members and ministers of the church of England do not hold the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, we are most happy to admit, though we cannot but lament that they should lend their influence to support a system by which it is maintained; and that, to vindicate themselves, they are obliged to adopt modes of reasoning, which only prove the uselessness of all creeds and articles, and which tend to lessen confidence in men's professions, even when their integrity cannot be impeached.

Mr. Stovel's lectures cannot be so readily described, being of greater magnitude, and less remarkable for clearness of style and arrangement. The contest between Mr. M. and his opponents, having excited much attention to the subject of baptism, and the one party failing to prove that baptismal regeneration was not the doctrine of the church of England, and the other, that it was the doctrine of the Bible; it was deemed expedient by some to bring a new combatant on the field. Mr. Stovel obeyed the call addressed to him, and delivered these lectures, which have since been published. Though the primary object of the course was to disprove baptismal regeneration, yet it is evident that the principal object was to disprove infant baptism. The author seems to have regarded the former as an easy task; and the grand achievement to which he bends his energies, is the proof that infant baptism always is associated with this error, or with others that differ from it merely in name. Now, though some may deem it a proof that the method of a controversialist is a good one, if an opponent finds fault with it, yet we must declare our conviction, that in thus combining matters which are essentially different, Mr. S. has greatly erred; and that much of the confusion which prevails throughout the lectures, results from the adoption of this plan. If Mr. S. had set distinctly and separately before his mind the proposition, that baptismal regeneration, or errors equally injurious, are taught by our ministers, and believed by our congregations, he would have seen the necessity of supporting this proposition by arguments very different from those which he has introduced for this end, into the discussion of another subject.

The first lecture is introductory: after some reference to the immediate occasion of the lectures, Mr. S. proceeds to state, that his controversy is not with the church of England only, but with all pædo-baptist churches. With a frequency and vehemence of assertion, which, to some minds, will have the force of proof, and compensate for the absence of evidence, he declares that all who practise infant baptism are alike. "Baptismal regeneration" he says, "is only one form in which the error is stated. Where these words are rejected with abhorrence, benefits are ascribed to infant baptism, which are quite unscriptural, and the supposition of which, has *almost the same moral effect upon mankind*. With some it is a seal of the covenant; with others it is an introduction into the visible church." p. 21. He describes all pædo-baptists as parties "near akin;" and styles the opposition of any to the errors of others "most unnaturally flagitious." p. 24. "The error of Rome," he says, "is exactly the same with that of the Tractarians." "It is coincident with that of the Assembly of Divines, and multitudes of dissenting pædo-baptists." p. 25. Again, p. 26, "Now this surly expression will afford you an instance of that indignant and guilty anger, with which these several associates in error resent their

detection in bad society. They call the church of Rome by foul names, such as Babylon, and the Great Whore, and so forth ; and by possibility she may deserve these appellations. But why, then, should they drink of the cup which has been filled with her abominations, and loiter about the threshold of her gates ?" Then follows a low illustration, which we will not inflict on our readers. A little farther on, we are informed that there are dissenting pædo-baptists, "who burst with spleen when spoken of as participating in Tractarianism ; and yet, by the benefits they ascribe to infant and promiscuous baptism, convey the very same principle into their own institutions. They do not seem to me to be dishonest, but rather victims of their own reasonings and neglect of Scripture ; for thus, as though self-deceived, each falls into the error that he condemns. This, then, is the state of the question : *for it matters very little in what form the poison may be administered : it will take effect in every state and every combination, in which it is or can be received ; and if it have but time and scope for action, the least particle will prove fatal to the best interests of mankind.*" p. 30. "It is with all, therefore, that we have to do." p. 31. With most exemplary candour, he says, p. 32, "Let others take advantage of artifice if they please ; we will rather court and seek that of simple, direct, and open-hearted integrity." With a compassion for which we cannot be sufficiently grateful, he admonishes us most solemnly, and tells us that words, which we might have regarded as hasty expressions, have all been considerably penned. "It is on this account, my brethren, because it is for your life, and that of your offspring, that this duty was undertaken ; and, in performing it, the feelings have been chained so much to a written document, that greater calmness and clearness of expression might render the reasoning more distinct and conclusive." Having thus stated his question, and described the parties who are implicated in his charge, he dilates on the importance of the subject. He informs us, that, in his judgment, "no deception can be more gross, or more injurious to the species," than that which he has described as the common error of those who practise infant baptism ; and that, thereby, "the professed agency of mercy would be reduced to contempt." He warns us that "there is no severity which the authors of such a delusion might not expect from the recoil of injured, oppressed, and insulted humanity," p. 35. The infidelity of France, the apostacy of Talleyrand, the impious hypocrisy of unbelieving priests, are all attributed to this same delusion. Parents are said not to pray for the conversion of their children, and not to teach them the necessity of regeneration, because of infant baptism. All the worst consequences that result from the worst forms in which the tenet of baptismal regeneration has been held, are collected, and then the author quietly remarks, "The question relates, you perceive, to all such benefits as are and have been

ascribed to infant baptism, whether they be called regeneration, or by any other name." p. 39.

Now we altogether deny the truth of the statements and insinuations which Mr. S. here puts forth. He advances no proof that the doctrines of evangelical pædo-baptists are the same with those of the Anglo and Roman catholics, or that their tendency is similar. Something like evidence is adduced in another lecture, which we will shortly notice; but here we have nothing but Mr. Stovel's assertion. We think, in all fairness, the accusation should have been supported at the time it was made. The mode of proceeding which has been adopted, we believe inadvertently, is most sophistical. By asserting, again and again, the same thing, he doubtless left on the minds of many the impression that all pædo-baptists held substantially the same views; and if no evidence was adduced, it might by some be innocently imagined, that the point was too plain to require proof. The natural result of this course is, that when it has been shown that the opinions of *some* pædo-baptists are unscriptural, pernicious, and absurd, this conclusion is transferred to *all others* who have been, for the purposes of controversy, associated with the convicted party.

The second lecture is also introductory, and professedly historical; and here we meet with another fault in method, as glaring as the former. In considering the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, it is evident that the questions of its *truth*, and of its origin, are identical. If true, it came from the apostles; and if it sprung up in later times, it must be false. But before entering on the clear field of scriptural investigation, Mr. S. goes off to the obscure regions of ecclesiastical history; as if any were more likely to receive his accounts of Christian antiquity, than his interpretation of the sacred Scriptures. Yet he says, "There can be no objection to prepare the way for an appeal to Scripture, by reviewing the origin and diffusion of the sentiment in dispute." p. 4. His most strange justification of this plan is this: "Before we can conduct an appeal to Scripture in such a case, it is necessary to know the character of the appellants." p. 47. To us it appears, that the truth of any doctrine may be better tried by an appeal to the word of God, than by an examination of the characters of those who hold it: and that if the latter course be pursued, Mr. S. ought to have examined the character of Congregational churches, to show the tendencies of their opinions; and so on for all the other parties. Instead of adopting this method, Mr. S. adduces the indecencies, absurdities, and impieties of distant ages. He traces the doctrine he opposes to Zoroaster, and describes its course downward from him through heathen philosophers, and many foolish and wicked heretics. The obvious tendency, if not the design of his remarks, is to produce the impression, that not only baptismal regeneration, but infant baptism, in every form, is to be estimated by the character of those with

whom, he says, these opinions and practices originated—men who “laboured to do away with the great duties of hearing, thinking, believing and resolving, and strove to build the hopes of men on the operation of a physical effluvia.”—p. 22.

We have no concern at present with the statements made in reference to the ancient churches, the Roman catholics, and the Puseyites; but we cannot avoid remarking that it is by the misinterpretation of one or two testimonies Mr. S. supports the proposition, that “the pre-requisites of ancient baptism include all that we now understand by regeneration, faith, repentance, obedience, and designed self-devotion.” Thus, when Justin Martyr speaks of baptism as a “washing on account of forgiveness of sins and for regeneration,” (*ὑπὲρ ἀφέσεως ἁμαρτιῶν καὶ εἰς ἀναγέννησιν λουτρὸν*), it is a most unwarrantable inference that the forgiveness, or the regeneration, preceded the rite. The whole tenor of historical evidence contradicts such an interpretation. We do not in the least envy the Puseyites the many commendations which they receive from our author, though we cannot but regard, as rather extraordinary, such expressions of complacency, especially when they are contrasted with the severe terms used towards those with whom we had supposed Mr. S. was more intimately allied. There are a few observations which we would make on the evidence by which Mr. S. seeks to inculcate the Westminster assembly, and the divines of the seventeenth century who observed infant baptism. Some of them held views which we think erroneous, and others have expressed themselves in a manner which, though natural then, we can now see to be objectionable. But Mr. S. has adduced no evidence to show that the views of the evangelical Presbyterians and Independents of that time, were similar either in form or tendency to those he condemns. Indeed he admits that they differed in several points, but these he is pleased to regard as immaterial, and therefore they are summarily dismissed. Thus he acknowledges, first, that they taught only that *some* grace was given in baptism, but not that the soul was then regenerated:—secondly, that this grace was not given *always*, but only when God saw fit thus to answer the prayers of his people, and honour his own ordinance:—and lastly, that it was only when the rite was *religiously observed by true Christians*, that any blessing could be anticipated; and that the rite, apart from these conditions, was useless. Besides attributing to baptized children certain benefits which Mr. S. would deny to them, the divines to whom he refers, appear to have regarded other privileges as peculiar to such children, which Mr. S. would acknowledge belong equally to all. The latter class of privileges, of which baptism may be a sign, but which may be possessed without this sign, are by far the most important. To attribute these to baptism may be an error; we regard it as such, and one of unfavourable tendency towards

unbaptized children ; but we cannot see how it should exert an injurious influence on those who are baptized, who are merely taught that the privileges, which all admit they do possess, have a connexion with the administration of baptism, which they have not. It might be an error to inform a person who inherited a good estate, that this inheritance depended on his being registered ; but this error would not lessen its value, nor affect its use. So it may be wrong to teach, that the inestimable privileges enjoyed by all to whom Christian instruction is given, and the blessings of salvation offered, depend at all on the rite of baptism ; but their value and their use are not injuriously affected by this error.

Setting aside these common privileges, we cannot see that the passages quoted by Mr. Stovel, attribute to baptism, regarded as a whole, in which an act of obedience to what is believed to be the command of Christ, is combined with faith in him, and prayer for his blessing, any efficacy of a different kind from that which we suppose Mr. S. himself would assign to intercessory prayer. If Mr. S. presents supplications for unconverted persons, we presume he does not regard such prayers as altogether vain. We suppose that he would hope that the prayers in which his Christian hearers may unite with him, would, in some cases, be answered by the conversion of impenitent persons. He might as justly attribute all the dreadful consequences of which he speaks to such opinions and practices, as to infant baptism. Again, we presume that Mr. S. may invite unconverted persons to attend on the ministry of the Gospel, with the expectation that this means of grace may probably lead to their salvation : would it be right to charge him, therefore, with teaching, that all who came within the walls of his chapel, would certainly become Christians ? Yet this is precisely the way in which he treats pædo-baptists. Is it moreover nothing in Mr. S.'s estimation, whether the communication of Divine blessings is attributed to what God does often honour by making them the occasions of his blessing others,—the prayer, faith, and obedience of his people,—or whether these blessings are made to depend on the physical actions of irreligious men ? The whole tenor of his remarks leads us to conclude, that, in his judgment, both views are equally alien from the spiritual character of the Gospel, equally dishonourable to God, and pernicious to men. Such an opinion is, to us, utterly unaccountable ; we are at a loss how to express our astonishment that any Christian man of common discernment should deem the doctrine, that some spiritual blessing may be granted to a baptized child on account of the faith, prayers, and obedience of Christian parents, as so like the doctrine, that the regeneration of the soul is certainly effected by the rite of baptism, in all cases, if only certain forms are observed, as to make distinctions quite immaterial.

In the third lecture we have a partial examination of the scriptural

evidence adduced in support of baptismal regeneration ; but here, too, it is evident that the foremost object of the author is to assail infant baptism. He gives concessions and compliments to those who maintain the former, which are turned into arguments and accusations against those who merely hold the latter. Scarcely any passages are noticed on one side or the other, except those on which something might be said against infant baptism ; and the comments on these are against the Pædo-baptists more than the Puseyites. The advocates of believers' baptism and of baptismal regeneration, agree in referring many passages in which great spiritual blessings are associated with some baptism, to the baptism with water, and not to the baptism with the Spirit. It is amusing to observe how, with great show of candour and magnanimity, Mr. S. admits that the Puseyites are right where they agree with him. He assumes to give up to them the application of several passages to water baptism, when in fact his own system of believers' baptism depends wholly on this application. This is very much like the conduct of one who should give to a beggar the property of another on the condition of going shares, and for such liberality should consider himself a most generous man. We are not quite so simple as to be drawn by such a display of "kind and dignified concession" to any similar renunciations. Mr. Stovel says—"It is a positive declaration, unguarded and unmodified, that without exception, all who had been baptized into Christ, had put on Christ,—had been buried with Christ,—had crucified the body of their sin,—had become partakers with him in the likeness of his death,—were under grace,—did entertain the purpose of rising with him in a newness of actual life on earth,—were children of God by faith in Christ Jesus,—and therefore must have been believers." p. 18. From this he infers that children could not have been baptized with water, since they are incapable of these things. We rather infer that baptism with water is not here in the least alluded to, since neither in the churches of the apostles, nor in the Baptist churches of the present day, have these declarations been true, "without exception," of all who have received baptism with water, but only of such of them as also have received the baptism of the Spirit. Mr. S. says, "I entreat you, most calmly and solemnly, to remember, that I am now doing nothing more than gathering out of these passages, the positive instruction which they supply in this case, and which has indeed been collected and pleaded for in the Oxford tracts." To us he appears most egregiously to pervert these passages to the support of his own system, and, in so doing, to give to the Tractarians their most formidable weapons. There is nothing in these passages, Rom. vi. 3, Gal. iii. 27, Col. ii. 10, to show that what Mr. S. and the Tractarians connect with the rite of baptism, preceded rather than succeeded it. Mr. S. himself says, that persons

received baptism "*to the intent that they might rise*" to the new life which the Saviour promises and enjoins. If so, then they had not yet risen to this life. The argument which Mr. S. forms from the preposition *eis*, in the phrase which he translates "baptized into Christ," is really subversive of his conclusion. For if they were baptized *into* Christ, they could not have been *in* Christ before baptism, just as if a person were baptized *into* the water, he could not have been *in* it before baptism. Mr. S. does not attempt, by any critical examination of these passages, to prove that water baptism is referred to; and we must be excused, if, notwithstanding his "calm and solemn entreaty," we decline to receive his inference as "the positive instruction which these passages supply." We are not accustomed to take entreaties for arguments, nor assertions for proofs.

In his remarks on the language of our Lord to Nicodemus, John iii., he contends that men are born anew of water and the Spirit, and employs language very similar to that which he condemns. He says, there are "two agencies employed in that new birth, the water and the Spirit. By these a converted man begins life anew: not by water without the Spirit, nor by the Spirit without the water, but by the water and the Spirit." "Each is essential to the support of that new life, into which a believing sinner rises and enters from the moment of his baptism." p. 41. By the water and the Spirit Mr. S. says we are not *regenerated*, but we are *born anew*. "There are two agencies spoken of, whose operations unite in that one event." Now this distinction, to which Mr. S. attaches much importance, is, we believe, utterly unfounded; and we have no wish to follow him in "pushing discussion where delicacy can scarcely follow it." The same term is used in John i. 13, which Mr. S. translates *begotten*; and in John iii. 3, where he assigns to it a different signification, though the parallelism of the passages alone shows that their meaning is the same. And in the text quoted from Jas. i. 18, to support his distinction, a word is used (*ἀπεκύρωσεν*), far more suitable than the term employed in John iii., (*γεννηθῆναι*), to convey the idea which he attributes to this. If this unscriptural distinction be admitted, then the difference between Mr. S. and the Tractarians appears to be, that they teach, that with the water of baptism the Spirit is associated, which regenerates the soul; and that he teaches that with the water of baptism the Spirit is associated, which gives a new life to the soul. For we are told "there are two agencies whose operations unite in that one event."

In the fourth lecture, the injury done to true religion by the advocates of infant baptism is taken as the subject. Mr. S. does not take the trouble of ascertaining if the words used by any writer be employed in a sense different from his own, but he attributes to them his own meaning. Having done this, he easily establishes

his point, and seeks to overwhelm his opponents by conclusions which he deduces from premises which he has attributed to them. Not content with this, because he thinks that a certain course of conduct would be consistent with the views he has assigned to them, he actually charges all Pædo-baptists with practices to which many of them have been invariably opposed. We cannot believe that Mr. S. would be guilty of wilful misrepresentation, we must therefore conclude that he has an extraordinary inaptitude for understanding the opinions of others.

Mr. S. rightly states that the doctrine of baptismal regeneration has a most pernicious influence, by teaching men to regard themselves as Christians when they are not so, and by leading others to view them in the same aspect. It also tends to the injury of men by leading them to trust to what has been done for them, instead of examining what they really are ; and it dishonours religion by representing its blessings as dependent on what is external and physical, and not on what is spiritual and moral. But the views held by evangelical Pædo-baptists cannot be charged with these tendencies. A man will naturally neglect to seek regeneration if he is taught that he was regenerated in baptism, but he cannot neglect to seek it because he is taught that whatever good may result from his baptism, it will profit nothing at last unless he be regenerated by the Spirit of God. If it be believed that some advantages will certainly follow the use of any means, it is only necessary to inquire if the means have been used, and we are sure the advantages are possessed : but, if it be not certain, then, obviously, attention must be directed, not to the means which may prove either useless or useful, but to the actual condition itself. One who supposed that the rite of baptism certainly conveyed any grace, might deem it sufficient to ascertain that he had been baptized ; but one who believed that it was not the certain means of any grace, would see that his possession of this grace could only be known by the existence of its effects. They who believe that baptism with water, without any true faith or devotion in those who engage in the service, can secure the blessing of God, degrade Christianity to the level of magical incantations ; but they who believe that God may honour the faith and prayers and obedience of his people, by doing good to those who are baptized in the name of Christ, only believe that which is in perfect accordance with the revelation and the government of God, and with the highest and purest conceptions that we can form of his character. And yet Mr. S. declares, that it is not necessary for him to make any distinctions.

He attributes to all who believe that any spiritual good ever results from infant baptism, the same character, and the same course of conduct. "It is not needful," he says, "to make any distinction here between the several advocates of this delusion. They may quarrel with

each other as long as they please, over forms of speech, or for the greatest eminence and worldly advantage in dividing the gains which flow from their imposition ; with such things I have nothing to do. God will, in his own good time, deal with them on this account ; and vengeance belongeth to him." p. 5. We are honoured with a special mention in this charge of religious imposture for worldly advantage, which, in God's good time, is to receive vengeance. Mr. Stovel says he speaks in love, and with all tenderness ; so we must believe it. He remarks, "The most likely to complain are the nonconforming Pædo-baptists." For our parts we are not disposed to make any complaints, but simply declare that, so far as our churches are concerned, charges more false than those contained in this and many other passages, were never uttered. He states that in Pædo-baptist churches "the unconverted are systematically received," p. 13 : that among them the sanctuary of God is "stained with pollution and given up to the adversary," p. 16 : that "they endeavour to change the whole sense and spirit of the sacred writings," p. 20. Of their interpretations of Scripture, he says, referring here especially to Congregationalists, "A club formed in any common ale-house would not suffer so vile a misconstruction of its documents and regulations." p. 22. Of the one million pounds which are raised for evangelical uses, Pædo-baptists are charged with turning away a large portion from its intended purpose, p. 28 : they are described as the great obstacles to the salvation of mankind. The Baptists would convert the world, were it not for the stumbling-block of infant baptism. "The baptismal error enters into the whole constitution of the church, absorbs its resources, enfeebles its members, neutralizes its activity, and produces an apoplexy in the body of Christ !" p. 33. Again he asserts, "the license in admitting members has become so great, that in the great mass of Pædo-baptistical churches, fellowship is no guide to character at all." "As far as the hereditary principle is observed, this is also true with respect to nonconforming Pædo-baptists." "If in any case the church seems to differ from the rest of mankind, since the result is gained without conformity to the Divine law, it will be attributed to the taste and inclination of the age, and not to the power of God in the operation of his truth. But the difference does *not* appear, and hence the plea that their churches are really Christian, loads the Gospel with all the suspicion which results from their failure. Here is the great strength of infidelity." p. 36.

We can scarcely believe, notwithstanding the express mention made in many places of Congregational churches, and the frequent declaration that all Pædo-baptists are alike, that Mr. Stovel really intends to bring all these charges against a body of Christians with whom hitherto he has maintained something like fraternal intercourse. To some extent they must be intended to apply : to a greater extent than Mr. S. intended,

they will probably be understood. We therefore give to these charges the most solemn and emphatic denial. In refutation of the accusation brought by Mr. S. against the churches of our order in this country and throughout the world, we appeal to their character. We would not glory in ourselves, but to keep silence would be treachery to the truth, and dishonour to our Lord. We appeal confidently to all Congregational and Baptist ministers. We ask them to say if there is more regard to purity of communion, and more strictness of church discipline, in Baptist, than there is in Congregational churches. None are received to Christian fellowship in our churches, whom we cannot regard, from the expression of Christian sentiment, and the exhibition of Christian conduct, as sincere followers of Christ; and none are retained who are known to act unworthy of their Christian profession. This at least is the principle of our system. Exceptions may occur through the negligence of individuals, but we are certain that they are as rare among Congregational, as among Baptist churches. If Mr. S. chooses to say that this practice is inconsistent with our doctrines, we reply, first, that if so, this is no justification of his calumnies; and secondly, that there is no inconsistency between our practice and our system, whatever inconsistency there may be between our practice and the system which Mr. S. has attributed to us. No other kind of efficacy is attributed by us to infant baptism, than Mr. S. would attribute to religious services, in which the faith, the prayers, and the obedience of the people of God, are together the occasion of his doing good to others. No children are regarded by us as possessing the blessings of Christ's salvation, who would not be so regarded by Mr. S. himself. We believe that the advantages connected with Christian parentage are among the best privileges, the best means of good, that God bestows, and that they often lead to true conversion, and to life eternal. Our children are taught to be thankful to God, that their lot has been placed among the families of his servants; but they are never taught that therefore they are approved of God, and will obtain salvation. They are never received into our churches because they possess these privileges, but because they have been brought to use them, and have become the servants and children of the God of their fathers. We believe that children and adults, apart from any consent or contract of their own, are under obligation to the Saviour; and on account of this obligation children among us are instructed and urged to trust, love, and obey the Saviour. But they are not taught that they will be saved on account of their obligations, though they do not yield themselves to their obligations; nor by their privileges, if they do not profit by those privileges.

We believe that Mr. Stovel does admit to some extent the value of the privileges connected with pious parentage, and Christian education: and also that he does acknowledge the existence of an obligation to the Saviour prior to any personal contract. Yet we cannot but think that

his estimate of these matters is very low ; and in some passages of his lectures they are treated as of no consequence. He compares baptism with the marriage contract, and says, "it is quite voluntary in any one to take a wife," "but when a person is married the law will hold him to the compact." Lect. iii. p. 30. The actions subsequent to marriage are surely *voluntary* as well as the marriage itself. Mr. S.'s meaning must be, that a person is at liberty not to marry ; he may rightly refuse affection and obedience then, but not afterwards. Is a man prior to baptism in possession of such a liberty as this ? Again, he says of the Jews—"If they had resolved before the passage they might have turned back into Egypt, but not so after they had passed to the other side." p. 34. Surely their obligations to God did not commence then : yet Mr. S.'s language implies that before the Jews were baptized into Moses in the Red Sea, they were free to do what they liked ; and in the same way, that before men are baptized into Christ, they are free from all obligation to him. We think that the children of our Sabbath schools are better instructed on this point. They can value their privileges, without trusting to them ; and recognise their obligations, without making them the ground of hope.

In his concluding lecture, Mr. Stovel reiterates the charges which he has before so often repeated, varying the matter by contrasting the excellences of Baptist churches with the vices of Pædo-baptists ; the good accomplished by the former, with the evil effected by the latter. From his language we might conclude, that it matters not what regard we pay to the character of those received into our churches ; nothing but immersion can keep out the ungodly :—that it matters not what attention is paid to Christian discipline ; nothing but water can purify the church of Christ :—that it matters not how holy and devoted the members of our religious societies may be ; nothing but baptism can exhibit their subjection to the authority of the Saviour :—that it matters not that by many acts of piety and affection, as well as by eating of the same bread and drinking of the same cup at the table of the Lord, they express their common faith and mutual love ; only the dipped can recognise each other as Christians. Pædo-baptist churches are worldly societies, where "the fellowship of the saints is polluted and betrayed." The Baptist churches are "a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a peculiar people." p. 9. We "are compelled to ask for silence out of charity," p. 15 ; but "they obey in peace, and invite inquiry." p. 16. Under the Pædo-baptist system "it is wonderful that any should be saved," p. 18 ; but, among the Baptists, by submission to immersion, "each one has crucified the world with its affections and lusts." p. 11. Among the Baptist churches, "faithful and obedient piety obtains its rich reward ;" while in Pædo-baptist churches, "error and disobedience to the Saviour's law yield no other consequences than such as we are bound to deplore." p. 25.

But we fear we have exhausted the patience, if not the charity,

of our readers. In regard to the importance of preserving the purity of Christian fellowship, we agree with Mr. Stovel. In respect to the necessity of using water baptism for this purpose, we entirely differ from him; believing that it was not appointed by our Lord for this end; and that so used it is a human invention, at best unnecessary and useless. Mr. S.'s language would imply that these things were so combined, that the existence of the former was almost incompatible with the neglect of the latter.

A benevolent but unskilful physician, who had given useless drugs to one he imagined to be sadly diseased, would value, next to the information that his prescriptions had succeeded, the assurance that they were not required. We cannot give Mr. S. the satisfaction of supposing that his admonitions have amended our Congregational churches; but we desire to give him the happiness of knowing that they were not needed. When the Baptist churches at home and abroad exhibit an elevation of piety and purity of fellowship above that of our own order, Mr. S. may have some ground for his argument—some plea for his admonitions; but not till then. We scarcely know to what class of persons we can venture to recommend these lectures. They are not suitable to those who wish for instruction in regard to baptismal regeneration; for they contain too much irrelevant matter, and confusion and feebleness have necessarily resulted from the want of singleness of object. We cannot advise our Baptist friends to peruse them. We do not think, in all the dark pages of controversy, more gross representations could be found than pervade these pages. We cannot recommend them to any of our readers who are very sensitive to misstatements, bad reasoning, and false accusations, since the perusal of these lectures would be a trial too severe for them to endure. The only persons who, we think, are capable of gaining good from the effusions of Mr. S. are those who are resolutely bent on maintaining and cultivating Christian charity. To them the exercise afforded by these pages may possibly, though painful, be beneficial. They will see to what an extent a man of unquestionable talent and piety can misunderstand the opinions and actions of his brethren. Hence they will be confirmed in the persuasion, that misconception is the great cause of seeming uncharitableness. We are short-sighted, and at times a dense fog encompasses us all. We can recognise our friends when they are close to us; but if they are a little way off, we mistake them for foes. Certainly, our Baptist brethren, if they hold Mr. S.'s opinions of our churches, cannot regard us with the sentiments of Christian fellowship which we desire to cherish. But we are persuaded that, by many of them, Mr. Stovel's statements would be repudiated as earnestly as by ourselves.

The Eastern and Western States of America. By J. S. Buckingham, Esq. London: Fisher, Son and Co. 3 vols. 8vo. 1842.

THE volumes before us form one of three series on America, which the ever-working pen of Mr. Buckingham has produced as the result of his prolonged visit to the United States of that interesting continent. We imagine we hear some "little crooked thing that asks questions," "wanting to know" (vol. i. p. 177) whether the pen was the only instrument by the aid of which the author carried on his work. Were there no scissors? To avoid all disputation, for we do not like it, we will grant the querist his scissors. What then? Have they been too freely used? have they been employed by any other than the "well-instructed hand?" are there any extracts from newspapers, statistic tables, published books and unpublished MSS., which it is not desirable that such a work should possess? To such interrogations we give our deliberate, final, emphatic, editorial No. Mr. Buckingham has travelled in "the beautiful land of the West," as he travelled in India, in Palestine, in Egypt, and along the coasts of the Mediterranean, as a man who knew well "what" and "how to observe." Yes, and he knew what to preserve. We shall always think that, in these volumes, we have a store-house of "facts and figures" on numerous subjects of great importance to us as men and as Christians.

But what are we to do as reviewers? We cannot—space and time will not let us—follow our intelligent traveller in all his interesting peregrinations through the Eastern and Western States; we cannot hint at all the varied scenes of beauty and grandeur—the works of art—the manufactories of industry—the institutions of literature and science—the plans of government—the codes of law—the works of benevolence, of which we have before us such abundant details. The writer, as he evidently possesses a mind by which no subject of interest and importance has been left unnoticed, so he has provided something to suit ladies and gentlemen of every variety of taste and pursuit—*something*, we say significantly, because the author is too sensible a man to profess to say all that might be said or asked for on the numerous subjects he had to notice; we say it, also, because a person interested in some particular pursuit, respecting which he may desire information, may occasionally wish that the writer had been somewhat more communicative; such a case may happen, but it will be rare. Let any man, with a desire for instruction respecting any object of interest in the Eastern States of Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, and Connecticut, or the Western States of Ohio, Kentucky, Indiana, Illinois, Missouri, Iowa, Wisconsin, and Michigan, apply to these volumes, and he will obtain as much information as any reasonable reader ought to expect.

For our parts we have, in our easy chair, had most delightful travels, in company with our agreeable and instructive guide, through these varied and charming lands. We have paid "repeated visits to Boston, New York, Philadelphia, and Baltimore." We have journeyed "into the interior of Pennsylvania, across the Alleghany Mountains to Pittsburgh; voyaged down the beautiful river Ohio, to its junction with the Mississippi; ascended that noble stream, most appropriately called 'the Father of the Waters,' up to the highest navigable point of the Rapids;" besides, we have made a journey across the flower-clad prairies of Illinois; a voyage on the great lakes, Huron and Erie; and of course a visit to the Falls of Niagara; and all this without any fatigue, without any "moving accidents by field and flood."

We have, as Congregationalists, been much gratified by the perusal of these volumes. They afford interesting information respecting our dear brethren in America—they illustrate the efficiency of the voluntary principle for the support of religion and education—and they give many valuable notices of the early proceedings of the Pilgrim Fathers.

When Mr. Buckingham was in Boston, he was much interested in the case of Mr. Pierpoint, which is highly instructive as showing the excited state of the religious world on the Temperance question; and at the same time furnishing a satisfactory proof, that the minister who is supported only by the voluntary offerings of his people, is not prevented giving utterance to his honest convictions. For the narration we must refer to vol. i. pp. 29—35.

Mr. Buckingham, who always manifests a deep sympathy in the story of the Pilgrim Fathers, gives the following valuable sketch of their history at Newhaven:—

"It was not until eight years after the planting of Boston, and eighteen years after the landing of the Pilgrims on the Rock of Plymouth, that the first settlers from England anchored in the bay of Newhaven, then called by the Indians Quinipiack. On the 15th of April, 1638, the Rev. John Davenport, B.D., a native of Coventry, in England, educated at Brazenose College, in Oxford, and ordained as a minister of the Established church at the early age of 19, landed at Newhaven, in company with Mr. Eaton, afterwards governor, Mr. Hopkins, and their companions in exile, landed on the beach at Newhaven, seeking, like the Pilgrims at Plymouth, an asylum in the New World, where they might worship the God of their fathers, free from the corruptions and oppressions, the restraints and the punishments, from which they had fled in the Old. Their first Sabbath was celebrated under an old oaken tree, for a long time preserved in the middle of the town as a relic of the olden time. The picture of this first Sabbath day is thus beautifully drawn, by the eloquent author of the "Historical Discourses" on the progress of the church for 200 years in Newhaven, the Rev. Leonard Bacon, now pastor of the first church ever established here, whose annals were thus begun—

"In 1638, on the fifteenth of April, (old style,) that being the Lord's day, there was heard upon this spot, the voice of one crying in the wilderness, 'Prepare ye the way of the Lord;' and under the open sky, bright with the promise of a new era of

light and liberty, a Christian congregation, led by a devoted, learned, and eloquent minister of Christ, raised their hearts to God in prayer, and mingled their voices in praise.

"How easily may the imagination, acquainted with these localities, and with the characters and circumstances of the men who were present on that occasion, run back over the two centuries that have passed, and bring up the picture of that first Sabbath! Look out upon the smooth harbour of Quinipiack; it lies embosomed in a wilderness; two or three small vessels, (having in their appearance nothing of the characteristic grace, lightness, and life of the well-known American vessels, which are in these days found shooting over the sea,) lie anchored in the distance. Here, along the margin of a creek, are a few tents, and some two or three rude huts, with the boxes and luggage that were landed yesterday piled up around them, and here and there a little column of smoke going up in the still morning air, shows that the inmates are in motion. Yet all is quiet; though the sun is up, there is no appearance of labour or business, for it is the Sabbath. By and by the stillness is broken by the beating of a drum; and from the tents, and from the vessels, a congregation comes gathering round a spreading oak. The aged and the honoured are seated near the ministers; the younger, and those of inferior condition, find their places farther back; for the defence of all, there are men in armour, each with his heavy unwieldy gun, and one and another with a smoking matchlock. What a congregation is this to be gathered in the wilds of New England! Here are men and women who have been accustomed to the luxuries of wealth in a metropolis, and to the refinements of a court. Here are ministers who have disputed in the universities, and preached under Gothic arches in London. These men and women have come into a wilderness to face new dangers, and to encounter new temptations. They look to God, and words of solemn prayer go up, responding to the murmurs of the woods and waves. They look to God, whose mercy and faithfulness have brought them to their land of promise, and for the first time since the creation, the echoes of these hills and waters are wakened by the voice of praise."

"Such was the beginning of the settlement of Newhaven, and what beginning could be more auspicious?"

We said that the extracts, of which these volumes contain so many, are of a valuable and important character, and we must justify ourselves by giving a specimen, which we select for its eloquence and for the instructive picture it gives of the progress of improvement in America, though, alas! that improvement, especially if "repudiation" should not be repudiated, has cost the Rev. Sidney Smith, and many others of our countrymen, somewhat too dear. With this extract, for we cannot give more, we must conclude, only adding, that these volumes are enriched by several most spirited and beautiful views—"Views in America," from the pencil of Mr. Bartlett.

"One of the last great works of public improvement in which the people of Boston have been engaged, is the opening of a railroad from this city to the Hudson river, so as to connect the line of communication with Albany, and there link the Atlantic to the great Western Lakes, with a prospect of extending the line from thence to the Rocky Mountains, and beyond these again to the Pacific. The completion of this line, as far as Springfield, was celebrated on the 3d of October, at that town; and some extracts from the speech of Mr. Everett, the governor of the State of Massachusetts, who attended that celebration, will sufficiently explain the importance

of the undertaking, and compensate, in their intrinsic beauty, all who may peruse them. The following are portions only of his beautiful speech :

" And now, sir, that the first great section of it is completed, I would emphatically re-affirm the proposition, that next to the days which gave us a charter of national independence, and constitutions of republican government, that day will be the most auspicious in the annals of Massachusetts, when the western hills and the eastern waves shall be brought together—and a bond of connexion stronger than the bars of iron that produce it—a bond of connexion, commercial, political, and social, shall bind the extremities of the commonwealth in union never to be dissolved.

" As I passed over the noble embankments, and through the grand corridors of solid rock, this morning, my soul swelled with emotions which no language of my own can express. In considering a railroad, most persons perhaps dwell upon its upper portion, and the action of its locomotive appendages. But I own the first operations of the engineer fill me with amazement. The rapt prophet, in describing the approaching glories of the millennial age, can select no higher imagery than this, ' Let every valley be exalted, and every mountain and hill be brought low ; ' and what other process have our eyes this day beheld, from the ocean to this first resting-place on the pathway to the West ? Nor has this been effected by those insane efforts of despotic power of which we read in ancient story, such as those by which the walls of Babylon or the pyramids of Egypt were piled to the clouds. No, it has been by such judicious obedience to the guiding hand of nature, following the sparkling footsteps of the river through the highlands, and tracing the sidelong slope of the hills, as to bring the work within reasonable limits, both as to time and expense. Then to look at the exterior ; let us contemplate the entire railroad, with its cars and engines, as one vast machine ! What a portent of art ! its fixed portion a hundred miles long ; its moveable portion flying across the state like a weaver's shuttle ; by the sea-side in the morning—here at noon—and back in the compass of an autumnal day ! And the power which puts all in movement, most wondrous ! A few buckets of water, which, while I speak, is trickling from yonder homely fountain.

" But, sir, I should greatly weaken the cause I wish to recommend, did I speak of it merely as calculated to bind together the remote parts of individual states. This same principle of connexion with the West is as much a law of the prosperity of the whole union as a family of states, as it is of the welfare of the individual members ; and in that connexion our western railroad becomes of truly incalculable interest. We stand here in Massachusetts, on the verge of the most stupendous network of intercommunication ever woven by the hand of man, exerting all the resources of his art to carry out the beneficent designs of nature. Without speaking particularly of lateral works, which could not be described in detail while you sun is above the horizon, let us reflect only, that from Albany to Buffalo there is, in addition to the Erie canal, which we were accustomed to regard as the wonder of the age, till these great wonders eclipsed it,—I say, besides the Erie canal, and the branches and feelers, which, like the great marine polypus, it sends out right and left, grasping and drawing in the commerce of every part of the state, I learn, from a memorandum handed me half an hour ago, by the intelligent gentleman near me on the right, that there is already a railroad communication with Buffalo for about two-thirds of the way, with the prospect of completing the residue at no distant period.

" Arrived at Buffalo, numerous steam-boats are ready to convey you up the lakes. You step on board one, which stops at Erie, a Pennsylvanian settlement on the lake of that name : here you are introduced to the vast system of transportation, and travel by canal and railroad, constructed in the Key-stone State, at an expense of twenty-three or twenty-four millions of dollars. But you hold on your way to the west. Proceeding on your voyage, you reach Chicago, and think yourself for a moment at

your journey's end. At its end, Mr. President ! rather at its beginning !! Here at last you are brought into direct contact with the most extensive internal communication in the world. You are now on the dividing ridge of the waters which severally seek the ocean through the St. Lawrence and the Mississippi. Here commences a system of travel and transportation by canal, railroad, and river, and the latter mainly navigated by steam, unparalleled by anything on the surface of the globe. Did we live in a poetic age, we have now reached the region where we should think the genius of steam-communication would be personified and embodied. Here we should behold him a Titanic colossus of iron and of brass, instinct with elemental life and power ; with a glowing furnace for his lungs, and streams of fire and smoke for the breath of his nostrils. With one hand he collects the furs of the Arctic circle, with the other he smites the forests of Western Pennsylvania. He plants his right foot at the source of the Missouri—his left on the shores of the gulf of Mexico ; and gathers into his bosom the overflowing abundance of the fairest and richest valley on which the circling sun looks down."

The Inquirer directed to an Experimental and Practical View of the Work of the Holy Spirit. By Octavius Winslow. pp. 358. Second Edition. London : J. F. Shaw.

MR. WINSLOW is well known as the author of several small treatises on experimental and practical theology, and we are glad that he has seen it to be his duty in this way to "contend for the faith which was once delivered to the saints." In his statements there are point and power, argument and illustration ; while the simplicity of his style, and the orthodoxy of his sentiments, must commend what he has written to all right-minded Christians. His professions are modest ; his attempts are not great ; and the efforts of his pen will, we have no doubt, through the Divine blessing, realise the intentions of his heart. He seeks to enlighten and to guide the human mind in its search after scriptural knowledge, personal holiness, and spiritual peace. His counsels are wise, and they are pressed with an earnestness which indicates a burning and a well-regulated zeal for the glory of God, for the honour of truth, and for the salvation and health of souls. May our brother enjoy a large measure of the grace he is desirous of being the means of imparting to others.

The small volume now before us, may be taken as a specimen of the author's views of the leading doctrines of the gospel ; and we can and do recommend it to the prayerful attention of that class of persons for whose benefit it was written. It is adapted to the end it contemplates. It breathes a spirit of enlightened, of enlarged piety. There is a warmth, a pathos about it, which cannot fail to enkindle happy emotions in the Christian reader's heart, and to satisfy while it creates some of his holiest desires. It treats on the Personality, Godhead, Offices, and Work, of the Holy Spirit ; and on some cognate truths, as they relate to the obedience and joy of the believer in Jesus. The work itself is designed for "Inquirers ;" it is, therefore, elemental in

its general character ; it is a book of first principles ; it presents the doctrine of Divine influence in some of its attractive forms ; and it will supply the youthful disciple of the cross with light, as he merges from his gloom into the liberty and peace of the Gospel. We are far from saying that it is fitted "for babes" only. Even some of those who are "of full age," are obscure in their views of the nature and importance of that work of the Holy Spirit, which it is the design of Mr. W. to explain and enforce. We therefore advise "young men and fathers" to purchase this inexpensive volume, and to ponder its contents. We do not pledge ourselves to defend all its statements ; and were we disposed to be critical, there are expressions and representations to which we should be obliged to object. We think too, that as inappropriate phraseology is employed, so sound principles of biblical interpretation are sometimes violated ; and, as a necessary consequence, several citations from the holy Scriptures are misapplied and ill-sustained. These remarks are made, not in the spirit of severe animadversion, but of "brotherly love," and to point out some defects which occurred to us in reading ; for we are concerned that so excellent a manual should be as free from blemishes as possible.

We are told, that "the 'strong man armed,' has entered and cast out the usurper ;" and again, that "every ally is summoned by the 'strong man armed,' to quench the Spirit, and bar and bolt each avenue to his entrance." If the "strong man armed" casts out the usurper, it cannot surely be said, that he quenches the Spirit. Yet these opposing statements are made, by using that phrase in two different senses. Is it, we inquire, correct to affirm, that "the Lord has so *ordained* it, that sin should yet remain in his people to the very last step of their journey?" That sin lives in a believer, even in the holiest, is a mournful fact ; and we demur, not to the statement that "the histories of all saints recorded in the pages of God's word, go to confirm the doctrine of indwelling sin in a believer," but to the notion that God *decrees* that so it should be. Between the members of a sentence there ought to be harmony and dependence ; of this we are sure the author is aware,—how then came he to describe the Holy Spirit as "flying," and "travelling," at the same time, and for the same purpose? A confusion of metaphors is always offensive to good taste, and bewilders the reader. In gaining access to the human heart, the Spirit is said to be "borne on the wings of his own love, and to travel in the greatness of his own strength." Again, "He," the child of God, "may ask a thing in itself destitute of wisdom." But the absence of wisdom cannot be chargeable on the "thing" supplicated, though it may on the suppliant. The folly is with the man who "asks amiss," not with the object which he solicits. Had Mr. W. composed more carefully, which he is capable of doing, he would not have said of the city in which the people dwelt, whom

Isaiah was commanded to comfort, that it "*had* witnessed the crucifixion of the Lord of life and glory." As the sentence is constructed, it would lead us to suppose that the Jews "*had*" already crucified Christ when God commissioned his servant to console those who feared his name. In explaining the phrase "a new creature," the author is not contented with saying that "new and enlarged views of the Holy Spirit, mark a regenerate mind," which is the case, but in his excess of anxiety to be perspicuous, he becomes confused. His words are, "Truly *it is a new God* the soul is brought to know and love." To confirm and illustrate his position that "the commencement of spiritual life is *sudden*," he cites a passage which cannot be construed into a proof of the truth of his remark, and which, as he has introduced and applied it, may mislead, and encourage the ignorant and the fanciful to take unwarrantable liberties with the word of God. "He (the Holy Spirit) speaks again, 'Come forth,' and in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, the *dead* are raised incorruptible, and are changed." That the regeneration of the heart may be illustrated by the resurrection of the body, we do not deny; but to affirm that in the new birth "*the dead are raised incorruptible*," is an error. The latter part of the following sentence (the italics are ours,) is very objectionable. "We cannot bring Him (the Spirit) by an effort of our will, *nor can we by an effort of our will compel him to depart*." Did Christ or his apostles ever teach the sovereignty of God, or the permanent indwelling of the Holy Spirit, in this way? And we ask Mr. W. whether he is prepared to defend his own representation, or whether he would be willing that any of his readers should adopt it, and act upon it as a rule of moral conduct? We think we perceive our friend's meaning, and we are not at variance with him as to the *truth* he inculcates; but to tell a man who professes to be a child of God, that "*he cannot compel the Spirit to depart from his bosom*," is, we confess, to us a startling and a dangerous communication; but we are confident that Mr. W. has exceeded his own intentions, for he adds, if not as a redeeming, yet as a guarding clause, that, though "no wanderings, no neglect, no unkindness, no unworthiness, no unfaithfulness, shall ever force him from your bosom," yet "he may be so grieved by a careless walk, as to suspend for a while his witnessing and sanctifying power." One more allusion to inaccurate statements, and we have done. The sinner is told, (see p. 352,) "Your warrant to come to Christ is your very sinfulness." The sinner may come; and as all have sinned, whoever comes, he must come as a sinner; but our "*warrant*" to come, is the free and unfettered invitation of his love—not our actual apostacy and our personal guilt.

We have drawn attention to these few imperfections in good faith, and with the kindest feelings, believing that the wisdom of the writer will prompt him to take a useful hint, by whomsoever given,

and lead him to revise his pages. We recommend him to do this. We think that this treatise is calculated to be useful, and we wish it to be extensively circulated among the young, both of the converted and of the unconverted; for whether they have received the truth or rejected it, or whether they are seeking the way of life, they will find in this book, encouragements, counsels, and warnings, adapted to their wants and circumstances. We advise them to give particular attention to the chapter on the sanctification of the Spirit—the one which afforded us the most satisfaction and profit. “Without holiness no man shall see the Lord.” Mr. Winslow writes as if he felt the importance and power of this declaration, and some of his observations on the nature and necessity of personal purity, are beautiful and striking. “The first and imperious duty of an unrenewed man,” he says, “is to prostrate himself in deep abasement and true repentance before God: the lofty look must be brought low, and in the posture of one overwhelmed with a sense of guilt, he is to look by faith to a crucified Saviour, and draw from thence, life, pardon, and acceptance.”

“There is an idea, fatal to all true sanctification of sin, which some believers, especially those who are young in experience, are prone to entertain,—that nothing is to be done in the soul after a man has believed,—that the work of conversion having taken place, all is accomplished. So far from this being the case, he has but just entered upon the work of sanctification,—just started in the race,—just buckled on the armour. The conflict can hardly be said to have begun in conversion; and, therefore, to rest composed with the idea that the soul has nothing more to do than to accept of Christ as his salvation,—that there are no corruptions to subdue—no sinful habits to cut off—no long-existing and deeply imbedded sins to mortify, root and branch, and no high and yet higher degrees in holiness to attain, is to form a most contracted view of the Christian life,—such a view as, if persisted in, must necessarily prove detrimental to the spiritual advance of the believer.

“The work of sanctification, beloved, is a great and a daily work. It commences at the very moment of our translation into the kingdom of Christ on earth, and ceases not, until the moment of our translation into the kingdom of God in heaven.”

“Holiness is necessary to the comfort of the believer. Sanctification is a part of the new creation. Although not the first step the soul takes into the new world of holiness, yet it immediately follows. Regeneration is a commencement of the reign of holiness, or, the planting of the germ, which the Lord causes to put forth its lovely and fragrant flower. In proportion as the sanctification of a believer advances, his real happiness advances with it. It is from heaven, and it conveys into the heart the happiness of heaven; so that he who is most holy, has most of the material of heaven in his soul. O how loudly does the happiness of a child of God plead for his holiness! His soul approximating to the likeness of God,—his circumstances, trying as they may be, cannot remove the fine edge of his inward and concealed enjoyments. Yea, sanctified by the indwelling Spirit, trials do but heighten those enjoyments, and are found to be the most effective auxiliaries to the maintaining of holiness in his soul.”

Such remarks as these cannot fail to be useful, and the head and the heart that dictated them, must be conscious of a close connexion between vital and practical religion, and between religion itself and the Spirit of God, its sole author.

We have more than exceeded our limits, but we cannot lay down

our pen till we have recorded our decided and long-cherished conviction, that scriptural views of the person and work of the Holy Spirit are essential to the prosperity of religion in the soul, and to the efficiency of the Christian ministry. The piety of the most spiritual and devoted disciple of the cross must languish, unless it be sustained by the grace of the Holy Spirit; and the preacher of righteousness, however highly gifted, and though fitted by natural and acquired ability for the most important pastorate in the church, must fail in his attempts to win souls to Christ, and to edify his people, if the Holy Spirit be not with him, first to teach him the truth he ought to preach, and then to bless the exposition of his own word and will to the salvation of those who hear. We cannot be too explicit in our statements of the sinner's personal guilt and responsibility; but we must not—we dare not, dishonour the Holy Spirit by occasional and heartless allusions to his divinity, offices, and grace. The doctrine of Divine influence must be maintained in our theological literature, and by the pastors and teachers of God's flock, or the dearth of vital godliness and a desolating religious formalism will be our sin, and our ruin. The Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit *must be* honoured. It is Jehovah's will that the Spirit should bless the church, and that the church should glorify the Spirit. His requirement in the latter case is as clearly revealed as his promise in the former. "Thy will, O Lord, be done." May thy church be alive to the claims of the Spirit; may she welcome the promised influences of the Spirit; may she realise the presence and power of the Spirit, and to the voice of the Spirit let her give constant and attentive heed. Then will her ministers be sons of light, and her members children of the morning: then will salvation come to Zion, and from Zion there shall proceed an influence to prostrate the world before Christ in penitence, and to elevate it to hope, to purity, to joy. We agree with our author, that "all we want is a richer and a more enlarged degree of the reviving, sealing, and witnessing influence of the Holy Ghost. This will sanctify and bless the learning, the wealth, and the influence, now so rich an endowment of Christ's redeemed church. This, too, will consume in its holy fire the unhallowed spirit of jealousy and party strife, now the canker-worm of the *one body*; and, without asking for the compromise of truth, will yet, in the love it shall enkindle, so cement the hearts of the brotherhood, and so throw around them the girdle of a heaven-born and uniting charity, as will establish such an evidence of the truth of Christianity—the last that Christ will give—as none of its enemies shall be able to gainsay or resist. Descend, holy and blessed Spirit, upon all thy churches, thy ministers, and thy people! Descend thou upon Jew and Gentile; every where, and among all people, manifest thy glory, until the church, scattered up and down the earth, shall acknowledge, receive, and welcome thee, her ever-blessed and ever-abiding Indweller, Sanctifier, and Comforter."

Memoir of Greville Ewing, Minister of the Gospel, Glasgow. By his Daughter. Svo. pp. 672. With a portrait. London: John Snow. 1843.

To the field in which the subject of this memoir lived and laboured, the eye of the religious public is, at present, turned with deep and lively interest. There, one of the most important ecclesiastical movements of the present century has taken place,—a movement fraught with instruction, influence, and promise—a step onwards, towards the manifestation and enjoyment of the liberty which Christ has given by charter to his church, and towards the unity in which, at length, all its members are destined to walk. The parties who have relinquished the emoluments of the state, that they might have power to throw off the fetters by which it held them in bondage; and, nobler still, have abandoned the fortifications which their own hands had so ingeniously and laboriously thrown up to defend the false position behind which they were entrenched, have gone forth to seek a dwelling-place upon the very ground which is still strewn with the spent weapons of their recent warfare. They have found there, not opponents demanding the surrender of their now powerless sword, but brethren, holding out to them the right hand of fellowship, and, by one consent, leading them, as their sacrifices have deserved, to the most honourable place in that voluntary association whose circles must widen and increase, until they include the whole church, and place it in a position in which it will command the promised submission, and, for religious purposes, the incorporation of the world.

The power of the social principle will be seen to have been a leading element in this recent movement. Minds, previously brought together in alliance and combination—drilled and trained together in the diversified exercises of an active party warfare—employing the forms of a subordinated series of ecclesiastical courts, and accustomed to the publicity of general assemblies—minds, so united and working together, have in this movement excited, sustained, strengthened, and decided each other. It has been the last movement of a party, long organised, and in conflict within the church of Scotland, now changing its ground and coming out. Within that enclosure, right or wrong in its principles and proceedings, it was a schismatical party dividing into two a body, which, according to the theory of its constitution, should have been one. Now that it has come forth, it can occupy a less questionable position, and perform a nobler service for the truth, for which it has been wont, on party ground, to contend. It can reciprocate fraternal feelings with the free of every evangelical communion by which it has been greeted. It can co-operate, with great influence and power, in the good work, on which so many hearts are set, of uniting

in open recognition, love, and fellowship, all who agree in the fundamentals of Christian truth, while yet they retain their conscientious differences in the minor circumstantialia. It can exchange the belligerent work, which it has left behind in its old enclosure, for the more pleasant work of pacification and union, in the wide and *free* field, now spread so invitingly before it. May it have wisdom and grace to fulfil the high destiny to which it is so auspiciously called!

We have thus referred to this movement because we think the name of Greville Ewing is connected with it by a twofold link. It is a patriarchal name in the Congregational communion to which he belonged. That body living, working, growing, without assistance from the state, helped, with other bodies, not only in presenting a practical demonstration of the problem, once so difficult to understand, how a church could be free from the state in ecclesiastical relations, yet loyal to it in political relations, but also in drawing towards freedom the more spiritual and active minds which still clung to the theory of a state union, while yet they chafed themselves with the fetters which that union imposed. The "Free Church of Scotland" has not come forth from the harbour, in which it was marked and bonded by the state, to steer a perilous voyage upon an unknown sea. Vessels more slender, and perhaps more enterprising, have been before theirs on the waters into which they are now fairly launched. On many an eminence around them are the guiding lights enkindled, and on many a shoal and sunken rock, are the warning beacons erected. Our hearty desire and prayer is, that they may avail themselves fully of the advantages to be derived from both, and steer a wise, a safe, a prosperous course.

The name of Greville Ewing was also once enrolled on an earlier page of the same records which recently contained the names of the ministers of the "Free Church," and remains there in the same predicament in which they have now left theirs. Whether there be honour or dishonour in that predicament into which the officials of church courts put the names of seceding members, they now share it alike. Four-and-forty years intervened between the events, yet we think it is not too much to say, that both in moral affinities and influences they are related to each other. It was an impulse of life as well as light, which carried Greville Ewing out of the frigid boundaries of the church of Scotland, then sunk in the deepest torpor of its wintry state. Other minds received that impulse simultaneously with his own, and it spread in different directions, and by varied instruments, through the land. It had its reflex and stimulating operation within the church which had been left, as well as its more free and vigorous operation without. The memoir of Greville Ewing is therefore necessarily, to a considerable extent, the memoir of his "Life and Times." Through the Edinburgh Missionary Society, of which he was the first

secretary—through the missionary periodical, of which he was the first editor—through the press more generally, which, on a variety of suitable occasions, he efficiently employed—through the Theological Academy, which he zealously originated and laboriously served—through the Congregational Union, into whose formation and proceedings he entered with characteristic ardour and delight—as well as through the pulpit in his regular pastorate, and widely extended itinerancies, he exercised an influence which spread itself in a large circle of which he was the acknowledged centre, and made itself felt in other circles with which he seemed to have little, if any, connexion. The amiable authoress of this memoir, therefore, anxious “to afford every possible facility for tracing the developement of a venerated parent’s character,” has also justly expressed her conviction, “that while the times in which he lived exerted on that character a very considerable influence; he was himself, in his turn, a principal agent in some of those events which gave to that period, at least in Scotland, an interest peculiarly its own.”

Perhaps that interest has been too much confined to Scotland. The strong national feeling, for which Scotchmen are so proverbial, combined with differences in the relative position towards other bodies, have given some peculiarities to the form of Congregationalism in Scotland, which distinguish it from Congregationalism in England. The two forms appear to be rather related families than to have been born and nurtured in the same home. There is a strong prejudice or impediment against importation in the North. The soil which produces the hardy plants that flourish, as transplanted in every clime, is uncongenial to the offspring of any foreign stock. Of this peculiarity of the country, as extending to education for the ministry, Mrs. Matheson undesignedly furnishes the following illustration, which connects itself with Mr. Ewing’s commencing labours as theological tutor.

“Mr. Haldane had also conceived the idea of sending to England, and educating there, a number of pious young men for the ministry, who might be taken, as in primitive times, from the various occupations of life; and chosen for the ministry on account of their piety and promising talents,—but never for the latter without the former. *He found, however, that considerable prejudices were entertained against that part of the scheme which embraced their going to England for education.* These prejudices were more particularly pressed on his attention by Mr. Garie, of Perth, who at the same time suggested my father as suitable to undertake the charge. Mr. Haldane, therefore, (some weeks after the proposal respecting the Tabernacles,) requested my father to instruct a class, which was to consist of twenty students; remarking that, if he declined the work, they must still, as at first proposed, be sent to the south. In these circumstances, my father agreed to this also.”—p. 173.

The ministry therefore, for the infant or embryo Congregational churches of Scotland, for reasons doubtless satisfactory and conclusive

as a whole, was to be of home nurture. Two results appear to have followed. First,—a closer union between its members than has hitherto prevailed between Congregationalists in England—an example worthy of imitation. Second,—a wider departure from the Presbyterian form of government and ritual administration than generally prevails among Congregationalists in England. The system had to be thought out and worked out,—to be constructed and defended too much on the principle of dissent from Presbyterianism. Hence we think—remembering that the human mind, in opposing that which is concluded to be wrong, is always subject to a tendency towards the other extreme—hence have principally arisen the dangers and occasional failures of Congregationalism in Scotland.

To the honour of Mr. Ewing, however, it must be mentioned, that he knew how to keep his ground against extremes in the path to which the circumstances of his course most powerfully tended. In difficulties, occasioned by the erratic steps of friends and fellow-labourers, and which must have been peculiarly embarrassing to a sensitive and upright mind advancing in the face of many enemies, and more witnesses, waiting to form their judgment and take their side, he was enabled to manifest both the meekness and firmness of wisdom, and thus to redeem a cause whose most imminent dangers at one time arose from the waywardness of its own originators and supporters.

If there were obstacles to the importation of theology from the south for permanent location on the soil, visitors were very courteously received, and, like respectable relatives, became great favourites during their temporary sojourn. Among the wise instructors and bright examples of our English ministry, now verging towards paternity, are some, who about forty years ago were “students from Hoxton,” sent to complete their training for the ministry, at “Glasgow University.” Mr. Ewing had at that time fully entered on his labours in that city. To him, in a very characteristic letter from the then devoted Treasurer of Hoxton Academy,—a letter full of faith and of the *kindness* which is careful to flow within the channel of principle,—the first company of three (one of whom has, alas! recently finished his course) were introduced and commended.

“The introduction (says Mrs. Matheson) of these friends to my father’s house, and more particularly, the addition of three musical voices to the usual singing of our family worship, are among the earliest and the most pleasing recollections of my childhood. It would indeed be difficult to determine whether the pleasure received, (as expressed above,* and experienced by many similar visitors in following years,) or that conferred on the domestic and social circle, was the greatest. It came to be regarded in the family as one of winter’s most interesting characteristics, that it was sure to bring with it ‘the English young men.’”—p. 293.

* In letters from Dr. Burder and Dr. Fletcher.

Prejudices on one side have usually their corresponding prejudices on the other side. They arise out of mutual repulsion, which has its seat in the feelings rather than in the judgment. They connect themselves with the minor matters of taste, and phraseology, and customs of life, rather than with the more important subjects of our deeper thoughts and settled principles. How frequently, therefore, do they yield before a little increase of acquaintance, and sources of enjoyment open in the region where blind prejudice had been wont only to stumble on causes for offence! Where parties have great principles in common, and great interests in common, the more intercourse they have with each other the better. Their principles consolidate and augment, both in internal and external power. Their prejudices loosen and pass away. Whether we are willing to acknowledge it or not, there have been prejudices on our side against our Scotch Congregational brethren. Would a deputation from them, even on any question which relates to the great principles we hold in common, have met amongst us with a reception so cordial as that which we have given or are prepared to give to the representatives of the Free Presbyterian Church? Other elements than merely denominational affinities do indeed enter into this case. Yet, if we heartily join to swell the cheers and the offerings which those receive who urge on their way with the stream of popular feeling on their side, ought not our own knowledge of the difficulties connected with a conflict for truth, when that stream runs against it, to enlist our stronger sympathies and warmer affections in *their work*, who for half a century have toiled upwards against the stream, and to whose indomitable perseverance through all varying winds and weather, it is in part owing that the tide of public feeling has now set in, which carries on its ample bosom the gallant fleet of the Free Church? Mr. Ewing was the genius of the Scotch Congregationalists. He received visitors from the south in a spirit which showed that he rather found enjoyment than yielded submission in exercising the episcopal function enjoined by the apostle—"given to hospitality." His personal memoir is, on this ground, entitled to a courteous and generous reception amongst us. And since it is connected with a fuller account than we believe is to be elsewhere obtained, of the origin and progress of the body, of which he was a distinguished leader and ornament, it will, by increasing our knowledge of that body, raise it in our estimation, and conspire with increasing facilities for intercourse and reciprocal delegations to the annual assemblies of the Scotch and English Congregational Unions, to draw closer the bonds of mutual affection, to cement our common interests, and invigorate our co-operative efforts.

We have said that the social principle forms a leading element in the larger and later movement from the Church of Scotland. It appears, from Mr. Ewing's Memoir, that the *missionary* principle was

the leading element in that smaller and earlier movement with which he was connected. His first *mental* separation from the charge he held at Lady Glenorchy's Chapel, Edinburgh, was effected by an agreement which he made with Mr. Haldane, Mr. Innes, and Dr. Bogue, to go with them, for the work of the gospel, to Bengal. The Directors of the East India Company refused their permission, and the design was consequently relinquished. Yet, the exercises of mind in which he had separated himself from an affectionate flock, from official *status* as a minister of the Established church, as well as from the endearments of country and home, for more general and perilous service in the cause of Christ, must have given an elevation, freeness, and power to his purposes and decisions, that would prepare him for any movement in which convictions of duty might stand opposed to calculations of ease or interest. Looking, therefore, at his life, as a whole, and marking repeated instances in which he was called to make sacrifices for the sake of conscience, or the sake of peace, it would seem to have been the design of Providence, while frustrating this early-cherished purpose, still to form him by its operation for his destined work.

The Company's Directors bolted the door at which Mr. Ewing and his companions knocked, for entrance to India. Another body, the General Assembly of Scotland, with greater solemnity and publicity, put under proscription the work they more successfully attempted at home. "Overtures were made to the Assembly from the Synod of Aberdeen and that of Angus and Mearns, respecting *vagrant teachers* and Sunday-schools, irreligion and anarchy!" How profoundly philosophical the classification of subjects! And how beautifully the steps rise one above another to the climax! On these overtures a pastoral admonition was prepared by the Assembly, and unanimously adopted. Four thousand copies of it were ordered to be printed, to be circulated among the Presbyteries, &c., and it was appointed to be read from the pulpit of every parish, the first Sunday after being received.

Our limits forbid the insertion of this Presbyterian bull. It muttered its deep thunders through the length and breadth of Scotland, amid the murky gloom of its night. But these were the heavy reverberating sounds only, without the power to strike the vagrant heads against which it was charged. Had the subject of this memoir lived a few months longer, he would have heard its condemnation pronounced by fervid and indignant lips, addressing the Assembly itself from which it had issued, and carrying an unanimous vote to rescind the "Act" with which it had been connected, "as one of the blackest Acts the Church of Scotland had ever passed." To have been one of the principal objects against which these ecclesiastical proceedings were directed, forms, now, a part of the honour and fragrance in which the name and memory of Greville Ewing are embalmed. "Blessed are

ye when men shall revile you, and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you, falsely, for my sake. Rejoice, and be exceeding glad, for great is your reward in heaven : for so persecuted they the prophets which were before you."

For the whole of that reward, the subject of this memoir did not wait till he entered heaven. "By patient continuance in well doing, he put to silence the ignorance of foolish men." By the diligent use of the talents intrusted to him, they increased, and brought with their employment a present reward. He was led onward step by step, to an eminence which it is not likely he would ever have reached in the ancient enclosure from which he went forth. As he advanced, one cloud after another rolled away ; and, at length, the light of his example, and the genial power of his influence, filled a wide sphere, from which, in a good old age, and encompassed with every blessing which in life's closing scene the judgment can value, and the heart desire, he peacefully descended to an honourable grave.

Like his Divine Master, he was with the rich in his death. In the sepulchre which has now received his own mortal remains,—the family burying-place of Sir John Maxwell, Bart., of Pollock, he had, thirteen years before, interred his third wife, a member of that family. His own hand has recorded her virtues, who, for five-and-twenty years was to him "a true yokefellow," and "fellow-helper to the truth," as well as the deeply affecting circumstances connected with her removal, in a memoir, of which we see the third edition is announced.

His labours were diversified and multifarious, yet were they truly respectable in every work which he undertook. His position required rather the ready hand of a workman, who had gathered his materials from the surface of many fields, than the profound mind which could dig deep into the original ore of some one unexplored mine. Yet one exception, and that to a minister of the Gospel, the brightest exception, must be mentioned. No man had more deeply and extensively explored the mine of revealed truth, or could bring forth its contents in more rich, harmonious, and diversified combinations. His expository lectures are therefore spoken of by competent judges who were privileged to hear them, as having had an interest and charm peculiarly their own. It is intimated in the preface, that some specimens of these may yet, possibly, be given to the public.

The qualities of the memoir are beautiful ease and transparency of style, discriminatory judgment, natural arrangement, considerable vigour of execution. Filial love and reverence for a father's voice, still heard in every line which he wrote, occasionally holds the daughter's ear spell-bound, when the reader, who is not under the same spell, would prefer to proceed ; and the sensitive restraint of so close a relationship, has led to a needless multiplication of commendations from *other pens*. These are pleasant embellishments of the monument

which Mrs. Matheson has reared to the memory of her father; but the firm pillar of that monument is the sterling worth of its subject, and the best engraving upon it, the simple detail, by her own hand, of his "works of faith and labours of love." These inspired words convey the true characteristics of what he lived to perform. The memoir cannot be read by any who have sympathy with truth and integrity in their self-denial, their conflict, their meek endurance, their untiring labour, their ultimate honour and success, without being instructed, encouraged, and improved. We trust it will meet with the reception and circulation to which it is so fully entitled.

THE EDITOR'S TABLE.

The Congregational Calendar and Family Almanac—1844. 12mo. London: Jackson and Walford.

Lectures on the Conversion of the Jews. By Ministers of different Denominations. 12mo. London: W. Aylott.

Baptism at Corinth, and by Paul, shown to be both in its Spirit and Practice Christian Baptism, and not that in the Jordan, and by John. A Discourse. By T. Stratten, of Hull. 12mo. London: J. Snow.

The Doctrine and Practice of the Church of England, as set forth not by Dissenters, but by Ministers and Members of her own Communion. 12mo. London: J. Dinneis.

The Necessary Existence of God. By W. Gillespie. New edition. 8vo. Edinburgh: Philalethean Publishing Office.

The Church Catechism considered in its Character and Tendency, in a series of Letters to a Clergyman. By J. Kelly. 12mo. London: J. Snow.

Hours of Business; a Glance at the Present System of Business among Shopkeepers. By E. Fowler. 8vo. London: W. Aylott.

Cyclopædia of Biblical Literature. By John Kitto. Parts VII. and VIII. 8vo. Edinburgh: Adam and Charles Black.

The Baptismal Regeneration Controversy considered, in Five Lectures. By the Rev. Charles Stovell. Second edition. 8vo. London: Houlston and Stoneman.

The Christian Almanac for 1844. London: Religious Tract Society.

An Exposition of the Lord's Prayer. By John Calvin. Translated from the Latin. 12mo. London: Seeley, Burnside, and Seeley.

Fragments of Expositions of Scripture. 12mo. London: J. Wright and Co.

Israel's Ordinances, in a Letter to the Bishop of Jerusalem. By Charlotte Elizabeth. 12mo. London: Seeley, Burnside, and Seeley.

Spirituality, the Duty and Test of Christ's Church. A Sermon. By the Rev. Jelinger Symons, M.A. 8vo. London: Seeley, Burnside, and Seeley.

Predestination and Election considered Scripturally. By W. Merry, Esq. 12mo. Reading: Lovejoy. London: Whittaker and Hamilton.

LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

IN the press, and shortly will be published, *Christian Consolation: or the Unity of the Divine Procedure, a Source of Comfort to Afflicted Christians.* By E. Mannering.

CHRONICLE OF BRITISH MISSIONS.

HOME MISSIONARY SOCIETY.

THE EDUCATION OF THE YOUNG ON HOME MISSIONARY STATIONS.

THE establishment of week-day schools on Home Missionary stations has almost become essential to their prosperity. The following reasons will show that there are grounds for this assertion :

1. The deficiency of *good* schools in most of the rural districts where our missionaries are chiefly labouring.

2. The exclusive and intolerant character of *nearly all* the schools now existing in those localities.

3. The determination of the high church party to break up the Sunday-schools of dissenters, by increasing the number of national schools in every direction, obtaining public money in addition to their own subscriptions for that purpose; and exerting the most extraordinary zeal in visiting, persuading, bribing, threatening, and where they can, compelling the parents to take away their children from the Home Missionary Sunday-schools, describing them as nurseries of sin, as placing the souls of the children in danger, and as offensive to God; offering, in some cases, instruction in the week-day schools without fees, on condition that the children go to the church Sunday-school, and learn the catechism.

4. The intimate connexion that exists between the enlightened education of the young, and the success of Home Missionary exertions. In districts where no proper schools have been in operation, there is but little hope of greatly improving the adult population. If the Gospel is to spread and to be perpetuated in such places, there must be efficient week-day schools in addition to Sunday-schools. There is no better way of morally elevating the people than by combining week-day with Sabbath-school instruction. The right arm of the missionary is enfeebled by the present paucity of week-day schools.

5. Justice and kindness to the labouring population demand this education for their children. There are three classes of children who need it. The first consists of multitudes at present altogether uneducated, who, if immediately attended to, might be gathered into week-day schools, and saved from pernicious error. The second consists of children who attend our Sunday-schools, though their parents are irreligious. The national school opens its doors widely to this class, and offers six days' instruction for nothing, or next to nothing. Can we be surprised that such parents leave our Sunday-schools when we have no more instruction to offer, and send their children to the national school, even though church is to be attended and the formularies learnt. Should we not rather be surprised if they refused the invitation? The third class consists of the children of the members of our churches, and of the congregations. If these parents keep their children from the schools of the church under the influence of religious principle, is it just or kind not to supply these children with suitable week-day instruction, in harmony with the rights of conscience? If, in the one case, we teach the parents to reject the erroneous instructions of the church, we surely ought to be prepared to teach their children a more excellent way, and not permit them to suffer injury, by confining all instruction to the Sunday-school.

6. There is a preparedness—a readiness of mind in many parents, to value and improve a good education for their children. This has arisen within the last few years. The general spread of knowledge has reached the country, and the importance of education has become apparent to multitudes who, some years ago, saw no necessity for it.

7. The Sunday-school system pursued by different denominations, in the rural districts, has diffused a strong desire for education. This is the case on the stations of the Society. In the 218 Sunday-schools under our care, containing upwards of 13,000, a large body of children is at once prepared to enter on week-day-school instruction—under the direction of those in whom they have confidence.

8. The unusual interest taken in the question of education, has produced, among other valuable results, a most earnest desire on the Home Missionary stations for the establishment of schools. The parents have been greatly excited, and they now implore education for their children. They reason simply—but justly. They say to us,—“If we have petitioned against the government plan of education as unjust to us and to our children, we must obtain it in some other way, and to whom can we look but to those who pointed out the evils of that plan, and who have always been the friends of education?” What are the missionaries to say to such appeals? They feel that *the* great struggle between liberal and exclusive systems of education is only beginning, and that, unless they now preserve their own Sunday-school children from error and bigotry, and, at the same time, bring a still larger number of the rising generation under suitable training, it will be a disastrous thing for our beloved country. So strong, indeed, is the conviction in the minds of our agents, of the necessity of prompt and decided measures, that some of them have established week-day-schools at considerable risk; others have collected children, and formed them into evening classes; while the far greater number urgently press on the minds of the Directors immediate attention to this most important subject. They have in a number of instances school-rooms ready; in other cases, the village chapels can be used; nay, so anxious are they to have schools, that some of them would even open their own dwellings to secure the object of their desire.

The Directors have no authority, and no funds, to allow them to enter on this department of labour, important as it is. They therefore unfeignedly rejoice, that a “conference” of the Congregational body has been appointed to be held in London, on the 13th and 14th of December, to consider the best plans for extending the blessings of an enlarged and scriptural education to multitudes now endangered by ignorance and error. May we not hope that the agents of our Society will be encouraged and assisted in their arduous work?

IRISH EVANGELICAL SOCIETY.

IRELAND should be regarded by Protestant Christians as a part of the great missionary field which they are laid under obligation to cultivate, which, while it presents peculiar difficulties, yields to no other part in importance, and in which the toils of devoted labourers are not without encouragement. The following extracts from the journals of agents will serve to establish this position, and will be read with interest and gratitude:

“*July 9th, Sabbath.*—Having announced, when last in Arklow, that I would preach this day on the beach in the vicinity of the town, and told the congregation that I depended on their exertions solely to make known my intention, I was delighted, when I came to the ground, to see how well they had done their duty. The spot selected was a sort of amphitheatre, formed by sand-banks, covered with grass. The day was bright and calm; the sea was in perfect repose—the little waves scarcely breaking along the extended line of level strand. On the other hand, the justly celebrated Vale of Avoca, in the prime of its verdure, extended for miles, winding among the bold, varied and wooded hills, terminated by the mountains in the distance, and crowned by the noble turrets of Shelton Abbey. Seldom has the Creator been worshipped in a scene more calculated to inspire feelings of adoration

for the wondrous works of his hands. In wisdom has He made them all. Group after group of well-dressed people, some of them highly respectable, were seen approaching the place of meeting from the town, while numerous cars came in from the country, and not a few travelled on foot several miles. The assembly was the largest ever known on such an occasion in that town; and the interest manifested—the deep attention of all, not excepting the children, while your missionary addressed them on the awful concerns of eternity, was truly and intensely gratifying. Finding that this attempt succeeded so well, I announced another meeting in the same place.

“ July 10th.—Having travelled twelve Irish miles after preaching last evening, I visited Tinahely to-day, and found, as usual, a good attendance, to whom I preached the word of life, and with some of whom I had an opportunity of conversing profitably on the things which belong to the Saviour's kingdom.

“ July 31st.—Spoke at a missionary meeting in Dublin, held by the New Connexion Methodists. Their chapel is near the street, and many Roman Catholics came in during the proceedings. Observing this, I addressed them on the rights of conscience, and the sole authority of Christ in religion, and was surprised to find them so warmly responding to my sentiments.

“ Aug. 3rd.—Went by the canal to Parsonstown, King's County, about sixty miles Irish from Dublin. This is the place where the two priests named Crotty opposed their bishop, and were supported by the majority of the parish for ten years, at the end of which they declared themselves Protestants. During this contest, two rival priests performed mass at the same hour, in the same chapel, for the space of three months, before two hostile congregations, separated by a line of soldiers with fixed bayonets, and giving to one another all possible interruption. The captain who then commanded the military, and attended every Sabbath to keep these poor people from murdering one another at the foot of their own altars, assured me yesterday, that it taxed all the power of the church of Rome to the utmost—required the exercise of every possible engine of her vast despotic authority—to crush this movement. This shocking state of things was terminated in the arrest of Mr. Crotty, the bishop's party having succeeded in retaining the chapel. The Crotty's then built one for themselves, and a few poor people have nobly stood by the Bible ever since. They are now in connexion with the Presbyterian body, under the pastoral care of the Rev. J. Carlile, who is doing much good, chiefly through the medium of schools.

“ Aug. 4th.—Preached at Parsonstown to a pretty good meeting of converts, on the honour due to the Virgin Mary.

“ Aug. 7th.—We had this evening an excellent meeting. Much interest was excited. Roman Catholics, in considerable numbers, overcame their hatred of the place, and came to hear. This was remarkable, as I was assured that all attempts to draw them out before, had utterly failed; and the very intelligent schoolmaster, himself a convert, told me that he did not think it possible to get up such an interest in that town. But just when the interest was raised, and nightly crowds might be expected, I reluctantly left.

“ Aug. 20th, Sabbath.—Preached on a Danish moat, at Hacketstown, County Carlow. There was but a short notice for this meeting; still, for such a district, the attendance was good; and what was considered very extraordinary, there were from twenty to thirty Roman Catholics; for they are in great bondage in this part of the country. Four policemen came to reconnoitre during the lecture, wondering at my temerity in venturing to touch on controverted doctrines and ecclesiastical claims, in these perilous times, and in such a place.

“ Sept. 4th.—Proceeded to Mallow, with the view of lecturing there. Some objections were made to lecturing now, on account of the repeal agitation; but when

I conversed with friends, these objections were overruled. Your agent, Mr. Gibson, freely granted the use of his chapel. It was feared the attempt to get a congregation would fail; but this fear proved quite groundless. The chapel was full by the time the service commenced, and it was evident the majority were Roman Catholics; and before the lecturer proceeded far the place was crowded to such excess that the Protestants became greatly alarmed. It was announced that I would answer a recently published pamphlet, on the 'Rule of Faith,' very ably and plausibly compiled, the work of a clever priest; but bearing the name of David Lyons, a mason. This circumstance drew out the multitude. But there was, besides, a plan laid to interrupt the meeting. A certain brainless tailor—a repeal warden—came at the head of a mob of 'lewd fellows of the baser sort,' to put me down. He began by begging permission to ask a question, which was granted: but not content with question upon question, which I answered, when they had any sense in them, he went on haranguing in a manner the most absurd and violent. He was cheered, of course, by his party, and the meeting was, after some time, thrown into such confusion, that it was impossible to proceed with the lecture. An old pensioner also spoke in a spirit of brutal bigotry; but the noise was so great that no one could be distinctly heard. Mr. Gibson, who acted nobly on the occasion, sought to still the tumult in vain. The multitude was divided—most were for hearing out the lecture; but the low mob would hear their champion. Mr. Gibson said at length that, as there had been such disorder, the second lecture would not be delivered.

"*A voice*—'One was too much.'

"*Missionary*—'Well, it shall be put to the meeting to say whether I am to lecture again or not. As many as wish for another lecture, say—*Ay*.' It was carried by acclamation that there should be another. No one ventured to say—*No*. Mr. Gibson, however, remarked, that it was contrary to his feelings to have another meeting under such circumstances. I said I never had been afraid, and never would be afraid, to proclaim the truth under any circumstances.

"The meeting then peaceably dispersed. I had spoken one way or another nearly two hours, and was greatly exhausted with the intense heat, and effort to be heard amidst incessant interruption. I felt much dissatisfied with the issue, knowing that they would make a triumph of what had occurred. I slept little, and rose with a heavy heart, determined to have another meeting if possible. I hastened to Mr. Gibson with this view, when I met him precisely in the same state of mind, equally resolved with myself, to maintain freedom of speech against all opposition. Fresh placards were issued, and six special constables were engaged to keep order. Of these, five were Roman Catholics, the most efficient by far being a young man who was deaf and dumb. Their business was to keep out boys and girls, and those whom they knew to be bad characters.

"At the hour appointed large crowds began to assemble. Our constables kept guard at the gate: and there was the most singular scene I ever witnessed,—Roman Catholics, of both sexes, in crowds, pressing and begging to be let in to hear a lecture against Purgatory;—Roman Catholics keeping order at a Protestant place of worship, and doing their utmost to exclude the disturbers of the peace. But all efforts were vain to keep out the crowd. They pushed open the gate, and quickly crowded the chapel. The chapel door was then shut, and two or three able men kept it barricaded, in order to preserve the congregation within from confusion. Meantime the street was filled to a considerable distance; and a policeman told me next day that there could not be less than 5000 people outside. The excitement seemed to pervade the whole town. Some endeavoured to hear through the windows; others climbed upon a wall in the rear of the chapel. A number of Protestant ladies got alarmed, and left the meeting before the lecture commenced. Others had the courage to

remain. Aware that the repeal warden and his party had got in, and determined to resist all such interruption, I began by making a decided statement that no interruption would be allowed. I said I was willing to meet any priest or competent person for discussion, at a fitting time and place, but that I was come there to deliver a lecture, and was resolved at every risk to maintain my rights, and that never should religious liberty be trampled on with impunity in my person. I also showed them the impolicy of their conduct as repealers. How could they be entrusted with power, when they put down argument with brute force? How could they disgrace their country by conduct unworthy of savages?

"These remarks had their effect on the meeting; seeing which, one of the ring-leaders rose, shouting—'Then, let the Catholics all come out—Out!—Out!'"

"I said—'Out yourself, sir, and let others do as they think proper. Let the disturbers of the peace go out, but let those who have come as rational men to listen to argument remain. Don't presume to speak here, or your name shall be taken down.' He was followed by about twelve; but a greater number rushed in as soon as the door was open. The tailor was following him, but he dropped into a pew, and held down his head to escape observation till this movement was over, and then he came back to his seat near the pulpit, where he listened very attentively. Except the continual shouting in the street, all was now quiet, and for an hour-and-a-half 300 to 400 Roman Catholics listened to an argument against purgatory, full of evangelical statement and practical appeals—exalting the virtue of the atonement, to the exclusion of all other satisfaction for sin, and urging the sinner's responsibility in the sight of eternity,—with a riveted attention which I never saw surpassed. The congregation was then dismissed, and all ended pleasantly. Some of our special constables refused payment for their trouble. I regretted that the fears and feverish anxiety of the Protestants, so unhappily common in the south, (where their sensitive, and almost ascetic virtue shrinks away from the rough and perilous tasks, without which the Gospel cannot be propagated,) forbid my prolonging this excitement, and obliged me to leave the field just when I had secured my vantage ground."

The latest journal of another missionary, among other interesting facts, contains the following narrative:—

"Preaching one Sabbath evening at R——, I was pleased with the marked attention of a venerable old man. He seemed to dwell on the words as they fell from my lips—(my text was 'Behold the Lamb of God,' &c.)—while now and then I could observe the silent tear drop from his eye. After the service, having some miles to walk to the house of a friend, where I was to stop for the night, I sent my horse before me, in order that I might converse with the people as we left the house of prayer. But none seemed so anxious as this old man, who walked for nearly three miles to speak of his distress about the salvation of his soul. Until this time he had sat under the blighting influence of an Arian ministry, the effect of which seemed to have banished every principle of truth from his heart; but he now, to use his own words, felt that there must be a Divine Jesus to save lost sinners. Often and earnestly did he exclaim, 'Oh, that Jesus would break my hard heart, and wash me in his blood!' On this Saviour I pressed him to cast all his hopes for pardon; and thus speaking we came to that part of the road where I must leave him to cross the country. He was unwilling to part with me; but at last said, 'Oh, sir, will you pray for me?—pray that God may have mercy upon a poor lost sinner, that comes to him at the eleventh hour!' With another friend we retired to the other side of the field, and there, with the blue heavens for our covering, and angels as our witnesses, did we pour out our souls to God. It was a sweet moment, and we all felt it good to kneel on the grass in prayer. We arose, shook hands, and parted. The old man's heart was too full to speak. He has been several times at our meeting since, and from all that I can learn of him, he seems on the way to Zion."

COLONIAL MISSIONARY SOCIETY.

BRIEF MEMORIAL PRESENTED TO THE PUBLIC MEETING FOR BRITISH MISSIONS,
HELD IN EAST PARADE CHAPEL, LEEDS,

On Thursday, October 12th, 1843.

THAT the Gospel of Jesus Christ may spread and reign throughout the world, human society on the widest scale must be prepared to receive it, and to furnish facilities for its propagation. Thus, the way of the Lord must be prepared. Rough places must be made plain, and crooked places must be made straight. Every valley must be elevated, every mountain and hill made low. This is done by advances in liberty, in literature, in commerce and the arts, in a knowledge of the true principles of government, and in the free, active intercourse of nations. As all these advancements of society furnish facilities for the spread of the Gospel, it is the wisdom and the duty of Christ's servants to avail themselves of them all, for the fulfilment of the great commission, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature." This has been done. Along all these lines of action thus opened for them, the propagators of the Gospel are moving with great vigour and effect.

Colonization is another great opening for the spread of the Gospel, distinct from those already named, yet including them all; for a British colony is an extension of liberty, literature, commerce, and art. It is a new experiment in the great science of forming and governing communities, and opens a new path for the busy traffic of nations. It is plain that Providence is employing Colonization as an additional means for the spread of His Gospel. His servants must therefore avail themselves of this, as of every other facility for their great work. They must send missionaries to the colonies; plant churches in the colonies; prepare in the colonies the elements of future societies, for the still wider spread of the glorious Gospel.

The European colonization of distant regions is now almost exclusively British. They are slips from the noble old oak of British Protestantism, British liberty, the British tongue and literature, character and institutions, that are now being planted, and are now taking root in the fairest unoccupied regions of the globe. What an obvious indication of the design and will of Providence! What a stirring thought in the mind of an English Christian!

British emigration fluctuates from year to year—in 1842, it exceeded one hundred thousand persons; in 1843, it will probably be much less. But take the average of a term of years, and it is certain, steady, and increasing. All probabilities indicate that its future amount will exceed the past. Already the European colonists in the British American and Australian possessions, exceed two millions.

Every one of the great denominations of Christians is in full activity in the colonies. Your own Society is in the eighth year of its operations. It has aided in sending out, or in supporting in the colonies, about forty ministers—of these, thirty-three still derive part of their support from its funds. It is assisting in the education of thirteen young ministers for colonial service—nine at Toronto, for Canada West—four at Montreal, for Canada East.

Two brethren have recently gone forth under its auspices, to labour in the colony of New Brunswick.—Mr. Porter, late of Crediton, at his own charges, but with the cordial sanction of the committee, to a church at Sheffield, in that province. Mr. Gallaway, late of West Bromwich, to commence a mission at St. John, New Brunswick, an important city, containing more than thirty thousand inhabitants, as the accredited agent of the Society.

To carry on the work effectively, ministers of mature powers, character, and experience, must, for many years to come, be sent forth from Britain to occupy the

principal stations. Several such have already gone forth with the greatest and most obvious advantage to the work. Several more are, at the present time, wanted, and applied for. To extend and perpetuate the work, a native ministry must be trained in the colonies. The Society is assisting in this indispensable department of effort in the Canadas. The Committee has offered like assistance, for the same object, to the churches and brethren in the Australian colonies.

The income of the Society is very inadequate. For the seven years during which the Society has been in operation, its average annual income has been, in round figures, £2350. Its income last year, in contributions from the churches, did not much exceed that average sum. Its present operations cannot be sustained without an annual expenditure of more than three thousand pounds.

The past labours of the Society have been blessed with great success. At present, the calls and openings for its operations are greater than ever. The hopes of the future unite with past experience and present facts, to commend Colonial Missions to the sympathy, liberality, and prayers of the churches.

TRANSACTIONS OF CONGREGATIONAL CHURCHES.

GENERAL EDUCATION.

THE Committee on general education, appointed by the meeting of the Congregational Union, held at Leeds in October, has resolved to invite delegates from the churches to a conference on this great question, to assemble at the Congregational Library, on Wednesday and Thursday, the 13th and 14th of December, the Chair to be taken each day at half-past nine o'clock in the morning, and services to be held in the evenings also.

This is a very important proceeding. The occasion is great. If the churches of the Metropolis and of the provinces respond to this call, such a meeting may be assembled, and such measures may be adopted, as will be an honour and a strength to our body, and a blessing to our country. If they fail to respond, and the meeting and its results be, in consequence, feeble, a noble opportunity will be lost, and our churches will be pronounced incapable of any great and united movement. But this we will not anticipate, knowing that the proposal for a conference has been adopted, not only with the sanction, but by the advice of some of the most influential of our brethren in the provinces.

The proceeding is, indeed, indispensable, if anything worthy of our denomination is to be done in the present great and general movement for the education of the people. Nothing but such a meeting will secure the necessary union, mutual understanding, impulse, and strength, without which our efforts can be but feeble and desultory at the best.

ADDRESS OF THE COMMITTEE APPOINTED BY THE ADJOURNED MEETING OF THE THIRTEENTH ANNUAL ASSEMBLY OF THE CONGREGATIONAL UNION OF ENGLAND AND WALES,

HELD AT LEEDS, ON THE NINTH, TENTH, ELEVENTH, AND TWELFTH OF OCTOBER, 1843.

The people of England must be educated. The work is great, but it must be done. The Congregational body must do its part in this great work. What requires to be done, must be done with vigour, and without delay. The Committee appointed to promote this great movement among the Congregational churches, feels that a charge full of importance and responsibility has been devolved on it. Its plans of action are

not yet matured ; but the Committee will not, therefore, keep silence on the great subject confided to its advocacy.

1. **NEW SCHOOLS.**—Congregationalists must at once originate many more daily schools ; schools of their own, schools formed by co-operation with other Christians or both, as the wants of different localities may require, or as preference may be given to one of several modes of action. It is not necessary, it is not practicable to prescribe one uniform mode of procedure in all cases. It is not in harmony with the spirit of our body to be bound by prescribed rules of detail ; but, whatever Congregationalists do, they will do on catholic principles, and in a generous spirit. In some instances daily schools may be required for the children of the numerous poor families in immediate connexion with the church and congregation. Such schools will be appropriately connected with the churches, being for the education of their own poor, and sustained by their own resources. Even in these same localities, or in the near neighbourhood of such churches, there may be an ignorant and neglected population, requiring what may be termed Missionary Schools. For overtaking the necessities of such neighbourhoods, Congregational churches will be prepared to act vigorously and harmoniously with other Christians, on the British and Foreign School system. In many towns, to secure any daily schools on liberal principles, Christians of different denominations must combine and establish schools on that system completely carried out. Here, again, Congregationalists will be found prompt to act with their Protestant brethren of other communions, contributing heartily their influence to such efforts—both their local influence and such as the Central Committee may be able to supply.

2. **GOOD SCHOOLS.**—The daily schools established by the efforts of Congregationalists must be good schools. They must provide for good instruction in knowledge, and for good training in morals. A good school will almost maintain itself,—an inferior school we cannot uphold. Nothing will sustain our schools, but a reputation for superiority. This we must give them. They must be seminaries of knowledge, morals, and religion. There must be a wise and vigorous system for raising the mind, and forming the character of the children. Education in England quite as much requires to be improved as to be extended. It is certainly quite as much the appropriate department of Congregationalists to raise the character of education, as to promote its wider diffusion.

3. **INFANT SCHOOLS.**—These form an admirable commencement in a course of effectual training for the children of the poor. In many cases they will be desirable ; in some, they will be indispensable. As the daily education of the children must so generally terminate at an early age, almost a necessity is created that it should commence very soon. Nor can anything be more important than to rescue from evil influences those years, when the opening faculties must be most powerfully acted on for good or for evil. As these years are used or neglected, so will subsequent education be facilitated or rendered all but impracticable.

4. **EVENING SCHOOLS.**—There should be evening schools established for the scholars, whom the necessity of labour forces from the daily schools, while yet their education is quite incomplete. An hour or two for each of four evenings in the week would be of inestimable value to the pupils for several years after they have left the daily schools. Every effort should be made to render these evening instructions attractive and pleasant. The education given in the daily schools, unless thus followed up, will wither away and be lost. This is the period when character is formed ; when habits and connexions are established ; when it is determined what the man or the woman shall be. Infant and daily schools, followed up by evening schools, and both assisted by the holy and happy influences of Sabbath-schools, will provide the education we want. Less than this will be incomplete, inefficient.

5. **GOOD MASTERS AND MISTRESSES.**—Such schemes and thoughts as these are all visionary, unless good school-masters and good school-mistresses are obtained. A good teacher will make a good school. Your teachers must have a mind for their work, and a heart for their work. They must have mental intelligence and religious principle. They must love children, and love to teach children. They must know children, and know how to teach them. Such teachers the children will love. They will make your schools what they ought to be. They will gather children to their daily and evening instructions. Where are these teachers? They must be sought; they must be trained. One of the very first things to be done, is to crowd the classes of the Normal Training School of the British and Foreign School Society, at the Borough-road, with pupils. Look among your Sunday-school teachers; among the senior classes of your Sunday-school children; among your young and active church members, for those suitable to be trained for this good work. Encourage them to engage in it. Raise into honour the work of training the young. Let the office of the master or mistress of the daily and evening schools be esteemed second only to that of the Christian minister.

6. **SCHOOL-BUILDINGS.**—The procurement of rooms or buildings for schools may be deemed a great difficulty. In this, assistance from the Central Fund may be least available. It is probable that nearly all its resources will be required to meet demands for assistance in training and supporting teachers. The providing of places for schools must be principally left to local enterprise, contrivance, and effort. Employ for daily and evening instruction, the room or building now only used for a Sunday-school. Make use of the vestries of your chapels. Open for a school-room an apartment in the dwelling of the master or mistress. When you cannot build, hire, contrive, submit to inconveniences, rather than have no school, or delay to obtain a school for want of a room. This is no time to stand out for more than we can obtain. This is no work to be hindered by little difficulties. A good school in an inconvenient place will, after all, outdo an ill-conducted school in an imposing building.

7. **OPPOSITION.**—Our scholars and their parents will often be persecuted. They are so now. They will be more so when we become more active and efficient in educating the people. This must be manfully met and borne. We must not yield and flee before it. The evil must be exposed, and shamed if possible. We go to the work of education as Christian churches, we must therefore advance in a Christian spirit. Neither exasperated nor intimidated, we must do our work, and meet our adversaries and our difficulties, in the fear of God. The pious poor around us will endure,—do endure much for conscience sake. Their constancy is often admirable. They endure the frowns of their superiors, denials of charity, and many nameless annoyances, petty to inflict, but hard to suffer, for truth dear to their simple and honest minds. These, our poor brethren, we must serve and protect to the utmost; but certainly we must, if we can, give their children an education worth what it costs both parents and children to obtain—an education that will fit them, with God's blessing, to enter life with advantages strong enough to counteract the opposition of narrow and persecuting intolerance.

8. **MINISTERS.**—The pastors of our churches will suffer the word of appeal to them. Without you, honoured brethren, nothing can be effectually done. Put yourselves at the head of this movement. Give to it your mind—your influence—your prayers. Advocate it, and collect for it, from the pulpit. Advise and countenance the teachers in your daily schools, and in your Sabbath-schools. Visit the schools; interest yourselves in the children; inquire into, and, if possible, improve the plans of instruction. Consider the schools as a part, an important part, of your charge. Be sure the effort now proposed will be strong or feeble—successful

or a failure—according as it is cherished or neglected by you. The position that gives you great influence, brings you under great responsibility, and imposes on you great labour. Otherwise it ought not to be—cannot be. In how many movements has your moral power been seen and felt. By use it has been gained, preserved, increased. Add yet more to it, by employing it more. Let your movement in general education be as powerful as it has been in Sabbath-schools, in missions, and in many an enlightened and benevolent enterprise. Brethren, it is calmly and deliberately said, “This cause is in your hands. It will be what you make it.”

9. **BRITISH AND FOREIGN SCHOOL SOCIETY.**—The British and Foreign School Society must be supported as it never yet has been. It is a tower of strength to the cause of liberal education. If you rally round it and give it your strength, it will employ that strength, augmented in your own behalf. Congregationalists cannot go on in general education without that institution. It is the great representative, centre, and bulwark of liberal education among the people of England. Its plans will guide your efforts; its classes will instruct your masters and mistresses; its influence will sustain your movement. You must augment its funds by contributions, and you must throw into its scale all the weight of our confidence, co-operation, and zealous attachment. If in every instance you do not determine to adopt its system in every particular, yet its principles are for the most part your principles, and its plans, experience, and documents are your guides. Let none of your plans or movements be such as to weaken the united strength, the combined action of the great body of the tried friends of liberal education, who are nowhere to be found, if they are not found in the British and Foreign School Society.

10. **MONEY.**—Money must be given, largely given, if this work is to be done as it ought to be done. The Committee believes that many are devising liberal things—noble things. They are intending to give as the work, as the occasion, demands. Soon will the Committee hope to put these expectations to the test. Here the Committee must be explicit. There must be no mistake on the money question. Unless there are large generous givings for this work, we had better leave it unattempted. The work is great. The expenses of the work will be great. The eyes of the country are on us. The eyes of the government are on us. Congregationalists are now to take their station in the land. A feeble movement now, will make them feeble for the present generation certainly. A vigorous movement now, on this great question, before the observation of the country, and of its rulers, will render them strong, respected, and influential. They are now to act for their principles—for their country—for that honour, without which they can effectually serve neither.

11. **OBJECTS REQUIRING FUNDS.**—Funds will be needed for the purposes, and must be contributed in some such modes as are indicated in the following sketch:—

I. Local contributions, for local purposes, managed by committees appointed by the contributors. These must be the main sources of revenue for school purposes every where. In many cases they will be ample and sufficient. No assistance will be required. The money will be raised, the school will be managed and supported on the spot.

II. But there must be schools originated forthwith in many small towns, and many rural districts, where there are feeble churches, or Home Missionary stations, wherein the Congregational interest is strong enough to sustain daily schools, neither alone, nor with the assistance of liberal Christians in the neighbourhood. In no parts of England are daily schools more needed than in such as these, where, without daily schools on liberal principles, knowledge cannot be diffused, nor Sabbath-schools maintained, nor bigotry counteracted, nor religious freedom upheld.

III. This is the wide and necessitous field for which the Central Fund must provide assistance:—

A. Within strict limits, and in plainly necessitous and deserving cases, for providing school buildings, other things equal, the preference always to be given to cases where no government aid will be accepted.

B. For supplying school fittings, and apparatus of books, &c.

C. For supporting permanently the schoolmaster and mistress.

IV. Another most necessary department for the resources of the Central Fund will be to assist in the support of deserving young men and young women, while in attendance on the training classes of the British and Foreign School Society. There let all your teachers remain the longest term allowed by the institution, and obtain all the advantages it can give. No care can be too great in selecting, no expense too great in training your teachers.

V. Last, not least, the Central Fund should contribute liberally to sustain the British and Foreign School Society. Say that one-tenth of all monies received by the treasurer of the Central Fund, unless directions to the contrary be expressly given by the donors, shall be paid over to the Treasurer of the British and Foreign School Society.

12. MODES OF RAISING FUNDS.—How shall the Central Fund be formed?

I. By donations—large donations—given on a scale adequate to the work and to the occasion; to be paid up within five years from the 1st of January next.

II. Donations specially appropriated to particular localities, to be eligible for insertion in the list issued by the Central Committee, as a part of the general efforts of the body in this great cause.

III. By simultaneous collections in all the churches on the Lord's-day, in every year, as nearly as can be arranged, to form the anniversary of the memorable defeat of Sir James Graham's bill, that worst of attempts, converted by the energies of the Nonconformist churches of England into the best of occasions.

13. STATISTICS.—Educational statistics. These the Committee will apply for as early as possible. Let them be promptly, accurately, cheerfully given. They will be wanted to guide your proceedings. They will be wanted to vindicate your character. You have done far more in the work of general education than is known or believed. They will be wanted for encouragement. Those who think they have done nothing, and can do nothing in a great cause like this, will be disheartened. But to know that much is being done; that many are at work; that you, separately feeble in your several localities, are yet parts of a great whole, and acting in a great movement—this will cheer, hearten, and strengthen you. These statistics are wanted to assert and publish truth; to test and check the partial and inaccurate reports of commissioners and parochial authorities; to bring into light facts and results which, for party purposes, such reporters are too apt to omit, or to understate and misrepresent. Ministers, deacons, schoolmasters, Sunday-school superintendents, you are earnestly appealed to for information which you alone can furnish. When applied to, feel it your duty to respond. Be assured that in so doing you perform a most valuable service.

14. ABILITY OF THE CHURCHES.—Congregational churches, you are very well able to do great things in this work. It is not a work out of your scope and power. You have great facilities for engaging in it. You will derive eminent advantages from all you do in it. You are a people whose cause lives by light and intelligence. You have around you, in great numbers, that portion of the poorer classes who wish their children to be well educated, who will make sacrifices and payments to secure good teaching for their children, and to whom you owe your best efforts to assist them in views so laudable. The weekly payments of such families will more than half support your schools. In maintaining these schools, the poor, who reap the benefit, will meet the larger portion of the charge. Already you bear an active

and liberal part in sustaining British and Foreign schools in all parts of the country. Now act denominationally to obtain the power and the means of acting vigorously; but employ the power so obtained on liberal principles. You will thus best serve the cause, and thus you will best serve yourselves. This is your true policy. You are professedly a liberal people, and by liberal things you will stand. A generous subscription to meet the strenuous effort necessary for the first five years, and an annual collection for the purposes of general education in all your churches, will enable you to add many hundreds of new schools to those already existing, and to educate many more thousands of children. Rise, and in faith and prayer do this work!

15. CONFERENCE.—Lastly, the London branch of your Committee for this object feels the want of a general meeting of its friends. The foregoing statements are not put forth as conclusions, but as points to be considered in a general conference. Need is felt for the impulse of a great meeting—for the discussion, by the wisest of your ministers and members, of many important points and principles connected with the general subject—for the weight which resolutions and appeals will possess, when emanating from a numerous assembly of your most honoured brethren—for the confidence which will be derived from the hearty concurrence, testified personally, in open assembly, of men of influence, gathered from all parts of the country—for the example and impression of such a beginning of the subscription list, as nothing can secure but a meeting like that now proposed. The London branch of your Committee for general education, therefore, respectfully invites its brethren to a conference for full and patient consideration of this great subject, at this great crisis, as follows:—

The time to be Wednesday and Thursday, 13th and 14th of December, at half-past nine o'clock, A.M.

The place, the Congregational Library, unless the members announcing their intention to be present should render a more spacious building necessary.

The parties invited to be the pastor, or one or more members, or both—of every church that shall desire to be represented—with, of course, all the members in town and country of the Committee on general education.

The Committee of the British and Foreign School Society to be invited to send a deputation of its members.

The London branch of the Committee will charge itself with all necessary arrangements for the accommodation and proceedings of the Convention.

Every gentleman deputed, and intending to be present, to announce his intention to the Rev. Thomas James, addressed at this Library, on or before Wednesday, the 6th of December.

CHARLES HINDLEY, *Chairman.*

THOMAS JAMES, *Secretary, pro tem.*

AUTUMNAL MEETING OF THE CONGREGATIONAL UNION AT LEEDS.

(*Concluded from page 849.*)

THURSDAY MORNING, October 12th. The delegates and brethren assembled at Queen-street Chapel, and the chair was resumed by the Rev. J. REYNOLDS, at nine o'clock, who opened the sitting with reading the Scriptures, praise, and prayer.

After the appointment of a Committee to nominate a special Committee for General Education, the Rev. A. WELLS proceeded to report on the subject of

CHRISTIAN UNION.

He said, he had been requested to present to the Meeting a full and authenticated

report of the proceedings of the meeting for Christian Union, held on the first of June last. That meeting had its origin in proposals considered at the autumnal meeting of the Congregational Union, held at Liverpool in the previous year; and as they had reported progress with respect to what had been done in the meantime to the meeting in May, so now they further reported progress by producing this exceedingly interesting record of those memorable proceedings, which issued in the appointment of a permanent committee, which was still sitting, and watching, with anxious care, for any opening which might present itself for further proceedings in the same direction. The document to which he had referred, he placed on the table, in the name of the Committee of the Union, that they might receive it, and deposit it among their muniments. Another document which he was desired to present, was an authenticated report of the proceedings of their Presbyterian brethren in Edinburgh, in July last, when they commemorated the Bicentenary of the Assembly of Divines at Westminster. This document made earnest appeals to the Congregational Christians of this country especially, for closer Christian union, and greater fraternal and practical intercourse. He had written to Dr. Candlish on the subject, and had learned, with great satisfaction, that a permanent committee had been appointed by the representatives of the five great Presbyterian bodies, who had united in these proceedings to carry out the project of further Christian union. Dr. Candlish informed him, that the Committee had received the Independent and Baptist ministers of Edinburgh as a corporate part of their Meeting. This was one of their first movements. He gathered from Dr. Candlish's reply, that the idea entertained was, that the Westminster formula should be the symbol of union, and that upon that basis other Christian bodies should be invited to co-operate in the movement. He had written to Dr. Candlish, intimating to him that the Committee of the Union considered that such a basis of union would shut out all their Wesleyan brethren, and that they were very unwilling to prosecute any scheme of Christian union which would have the effect of shutting out from fellowship with them so large a section of evangelical Protestants. In reply, he had received from Dr. Candlish an assurance that their Scottish brethren would be equally unwilling to adopt any basis of union which would have such an effect, and that they united fully with the Congregational Union in the wish to act, in any schemes of union which might be formed, with the Wesleyan brethren no less than with the Calvinistic brethren. Resolutions in reference to these documents and sentiments had been prepared for adoption, and would now be submitted to the assembly.

The Rev. J. A. JAMES, of Birmingham, said he felt honoured and happy in being selected to move the reception of the resolutions which had just been read—resolutions which he felt quite sure would elicit no opposition. It was the honour—and it was no small one—of this body to have been the first to hold out the olive branch of peace to all the different sections into which the Christian church was divided; and when it was considered how sternly they insisted upon the independence of each church of the control of all others, and of the independence of the whole body of united churches, of all coercion from all foreign power whatever, it was delightful to see a practical illustration of the truth, that spiritual independence is not opposed to Christian union. He could not but observe, in reference to the Wesleyan body, to which allusion had just been made, that they were not only committed to them by public acts, but inclined to them by all the feelings of their hearts. They had lately seen how satisfactorily and how successfully they could be associated with the Methodist body in practical measures. What would they have done without them in their recent opposition to the Factories Bill? Every thing required that the Methodist body and their own should be drawn into closer union with each other, and every thing indicated that the union was becoming more and more compact.

While speaking on the subject of union, desirous as he was not to trespass longer than was necessary on their attention, he would remind the brethren present of the immense importance of a still closer and closer and more compact union among themselves. It was only in proportion as they were united among themselves, that they could be prepared for compactly uniting with others. He was an Independent; but he was not the advocate of that rampant independency which, while it resisted authority, despised advice and co-operation. He was not an advocate of that rampant independency which, in the obstinacy of self-will, would refuse, on any occasion, to allow individual decision to be in some measure guided and influenced by collective wisdom and experience; and he repeated, he felt sure, that in proportion as, on scriptural grounds, they united among themselves, they might hope for a closer and more compact union with other sections of the Christian church. Had nothing else been done by the Congregational Union of England and Wales, than to bring about the meeting held in London on the first of June, much would have been accomplished; but a lively hope might be entertained that much more would yet be done. Perhaps they had made a mistake in first appealing to the people before they had solicited a general union of the ministers and officers of churches. They were, however, now looking forward to a general convention of the whole body of Protestant Christians throughout the world; and no one could look at the aspect of the times, or contemplate what was passing before him, without being convinced that Protestants, of every name, in every part of the world, must be more closely united with each other.

The Rev. THOMAS STRATTEN, of Hull, seconded the resolutions. He congratulated the meeting that the movement in favour of union had now got beyond their own denominational enclosure; that other influential bodies, which had hitherto stood aloof from them, were beginning to feel that there were great and essential links which bound them together, and that there was ground which they might take in common. This question had now got a fair start, and who could tell where its career would end? It must go on until the prayer of their Lord, offered whilst he was still in his state of humiliation, and just on the eve of his suffering, should be answered, and the church should be one, as the Father and the Son are one. He was accordingly rejoiced to find by these resolutions, that the cause was progressing in a manner of which he had had no previous conception, and that there was in contemplation a convention of delegates from the great Protestant bodies of evangelical Christians. He confessed that he liked the term "evangelical" better than "Protestant." "Protestant" implied that there was something which they had to stand against. He thought that "evangelical" was the more comprehensive, and, therefore, the more proper term to connect with this project. At all events, the object was one in which he most cordially rejoiced.

The following resolutions were then put and carried unanimously:

1. That this Meeting recognises with great joy, in the Meeting for Christian Union held in Exeter Hall, on the first of June last, and in those held in Edinburgh in July last, for celebrating the Bicentenary of the Meeting of the Westminster Assembly of Divines, as now reported, renewed proofs of the essential unity of the evangelical churches of the Protestant Reformation; as well as of an evidently growing disposition among the various evangelical denominations, to cultivate the harmony and co-operation so urgently required for maintaining the great Protestant cause in these remarkable times.

2. That this Meeting hopes to see the course thus auspiciously commenced, carried forward on a wider range, and to more practical results; and the Meeting feels a full persuasion that the churches and pastors of the Congregational Union of England and Wales will be prepared to sustain and assist in a general convention of delegates from

evangelical churches in various parts of the world, for united counsel and action in defence of the essential truths and principles common to them all, whenever Providence may prepare the way for so important a movement; or in any other less extended movements of a similar character and design.

FREE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND.

The Rev. R. FLETCHER, of Manchester, proposed the adoption of the following resolutions :—

1. That the brethren present feel themselves, as the inheritors of the cause and the principles of the two thousand confessors of the memorable Bartholomew Day, 1662, especially called upon to express their warm Christian sympathy with the noble band of four hundred and seventy brethren who, on a like call of truth and conscience, abandoned their stations and livings in the Established Kirk of Scotland, by withdrawing from its General Assembly, on the 18th of May, 1843,—a day to be henceforth, like the 24th of August, 1662, illustrious in the annals of Christian constancy and religious liberty.

2. That this Meeting witnesses with delight, the zeal and energy with which these brethren are, in the midst of great difficulties, proceeding to establish their “free protesting Presbyterian church,”—their enlarged views of Christian liberality towards other evangelical communities,—and the great pecuniary sacrifices and contributions by which both ministers and people are vindicating the energy of the voluntary principle for supplying the funds necessary for Christian churches; while fidelity requires of this Meeting to add, that its satisfaction will be still higher, and more complete, when it learns that the church-fellowship of this emancipated and independent body has been regulated by principles of scriptural and spiritual discipline.

He said it was quite unnecessary that he should trouble the Meeting with any remarks in support of this expression of sympathy with their brethren, who had seceded from the Scotch establishment. He could not but think that, in many respects, the movement which had taken place would have a most beneficial effect. Some of his brethren felt, as he was assured, an inability to sympathise, so fully, at least, as they otherwise would do, with the seceders from the Scotch church, because they still adhered to the principle of an establishment. He confessed, that to him that circumstance was rather encouraging than otherwise. If they had gone over all at once to voluntary principles, he believed that they would not have had so clear and practical a demonstration of the incompatibility of the independence of the church with a state connexion. They still clung to their old theory, but he believed it would not be long before they renounced it, and adopted the principles of voluntary Christianity.

The Rev. JONATHAN GLYDE, of Bradford, seconded the resolution, and after a verbal alteration, suggested by the Rev. R. W. HAMILTON, was agreed to, and the resolutions were cordially adopted by the Meeting.

FINANCES OF THE CONGREGATIONAL UNION.

The following document was then read by the Chairman :—

Memorial on the Financial Position of the Congregational Union of England and Wales.

The financial position of the Union is not satisfactory: it is, on the contrary, one of serious difficulty. Yet if the following suggestions are approved, and acted on with unanimity and vigour by its friends, all difficulties may be easily overcome and removed.

At present the Union is in arrear, or under liability, to the amount of at least five hundred pounds.

From the commencement of the Union, its charges have been met chiefly from the profits of its publications. This was never deemed a desirable application of those funds. It has of course lessened the necessity for appeals for contributions on the part of its Committee, and has removed from the minds of its friends the strongest motives for liberality in its support. Besides which, it is in principle an objectionable source of revenue. It is not well that the Committee of such a body as this Union should be sustained by, and administer for its management, funds not voluntarily contributed for that specific purpose; and therefore stand in any degree independent of the popular control of a body of subscribers. It is true, the profits of the publications of the Union have not yet been large, and the smallness of the sums so derived and employed has hitherto kept the matter very much out of view. Still in principle it is not well that the management of the Union should be provided for by the profits of its publications; and were these to become ample, it might in practice be found injurious. It is therefore thought that it would be a great and very desirable improvement, to obtain by subscriptions the not large annual income necessary to meet the charges of the Union, and to devote all clear profits derived from its publications to some benevolent purpose. The present is also deemed a favourable opportunity to propose and attempt this change.

Church contributions for such purposes have not been found to work well. The churches possess no general fund from which such small payments can be made. It is very natural that individuals should feel unwilling to pay for the church a contribution understood to be made by the body; and it is found very difficult to secure the collection of small sums to make up an annual church subscription. The Committee would therefore recommend an appeal for personal subscriptions.

The Committee therefore asks the sanction of the Meeting for the three following proposals:—

First, That an appeal be forthwith made to the churches connected with the Union through their deacons for contributions—say of two, five, or ten pounds each, according to their several ability—to meet the present arrears and liabilities of the Union, now reported as amounting to five hundred pounds or upwards.

Second, That an appeal be also forthwith made to the friends of the Union in town and country, for personal subscriptions, to meet the annual charges of management, reported as amounting to about three hundred pounds.

[Third, That should these appeals prove successful, then that from and after the next Annual Assembly of the Union, all clear profits derived from its publications shall be devoted to a fund for the assistance of aged ministers, under such modes and regulations as may be hereafter agreed on.]

T. PIPER, Esq., of London, moved the adoption of the above memorial. He said he felt exceedingly sorry that the proceedings of the Union should have been embarrassed, as it appeared they had been, by the want of funds; and he thought it behoved them to endeavour, in this respect, to place the Union upon a far better footing than it had already stood. He was not sure whether any regular application had been made to the churches hitherto for annual subscriptions, but he would venture to pledge himself that there should in future be a contribution from the Weigh House, proceeding either from the church as such, or from those who wished to have the credit of the subscription. He felt it to be his duty to make known, as much as possible, the pecuniary wants of the Union; and many others, he had no doubt, would share in that feeling, when they learned the position in which the Union was placed.

G. HADFIELD, Esq., of Manchester, in seconding the resolution, said he hoped that a very slight effort would raise the Union from its present position, and that that effort would not be wanting. It was very unworthy of them, he considered,

that they could not meet together without being necessarily involved in such a discussion as that. He would engage that the town of Manchester should subscribe towards the funds of the Union, and he hoped that other towns would do their duty. They were arrived at a crisis in which they would have to discuss very great principles affecting the church of Christ generally; and it was therefore of the utmost importance that their attention should not be distracted on an occasion like that, by a question which wanted nothing but a general effort to secure its satisfactory settlement.

A discussion ensued as to the application of the funds to be derived from the proposed plan. It was ultimately agreed that the third proposal in the memorial should be omitted; and with this alteration it was adopted.

At this stage of the Meeting, the Chairman was compelled, by another engagement, to vacate the chair, and requested the Rev. JOHN ELY, of Leeds, who had not yet joined the Union, to act as his substitute. The latter gentleman acceded to the request, and his so doing was the immediate occasion of reiterated cheers and laughter. When these had subsided, the rev. gentleman said, that having been betrayed into this anomalous position, he supposed he had now no other resource than to give in his adhesion to the Union, which was received with loud cheers.

ADHERENCE TO EVANGELICAL TRUTH.

The Rev. A. WELLS then read, as preparatory to discussion, the Declaration, &c., that we have inserted at page 857, which, he said, were prepared by the Committee.

The Rev. THOMAS SMITH, M.A., of Sheffield, said he felt peculiar diffidence in moving the adoption of this declaration, on account of the peculiar nature and interest of the subjects which it brought under their view; but he could not avoid referring to some of the points which it presented for consideration. He must first observe that he thanked and praised God, as he had no doubt that his brethren also did, that, among many mercies shown to the Union, it had pleased Him to give them a secretary who was gifted with a felicity of expression, and a clearness, candour, and devoutness of sentiment, which gave to the papers and resolutions of that society a very unusual character. Nor was this limited, he was bound to say, to their public documents. In the correspondence which was carried on with the brethren and friends in the various departments of labour, there was a spirit of kindness breathed which bound more and more to the Union every man who had been engaged in communication with their secretary. He would now turn to the paper before them. He had not been an inattentive observer of the great movements referred to in the introductory paper, and especially those of revivals in America; nor of the book which had possessed such a notoriety, and had been recommended to them by some of their excellent brethren present. He acknowledged he never could fully sympathise with that book, nor could he approve of the arrangements and plans in reference to revivals which it detailed. It was, he conceived, of the utmost importance that they should not take an insulated or partial view of the doctrines of the Gospel, or the mode of enforcing them, but that they should endeavour, like the holy apostles of their Lord, to give to all portions of truth their due prominence; and he rejoiced, therefore, that they were about to send forth a document containing wise, sober, and comprehensive views, both of the Gospel itself and of the ministry of the word. To advert to another point, he must say that he had not felt such alarm as some had done in reference to the doctrines of Puseyism. Remembering that the church of England had so often left the great body of the people who belonged to her pale, ignorant of the principles of the Gospel, he had considered that it did not greatly matter whether Puseyism or the papacy attached to that church in her orthodox capacity. He now acknowledged that he had been in error, in not feeling

greater alarm at the doctrines of the Tractarians, and he perfectly agreed in the necessity which was here stated for doing all in their power to counteract them. It was a delightful fact that they had made but little progress among their own people; indeed he was not aware of a single case in which a member of their body had been infected with these views. Their own denomination possessed peculiar advantages as respected the defence of the Gospel. Who could read Dr. Bennett's work on Justification by Faith, or Dr. Payne's Lectures, without seeing that they had a capacity and facility for defending their views of the doctrines of the Gospel which could hardly be enjoyed by those who were fettered with creeds and confessions? He cordially concurred in what was said in this document as to the necessity of preaching the Gospel in a fervent, earnest, and affectionate manner. They must not merely preach with doctrinal accuracy—in which perhaps they were inferior to no order of Christian ministers—but must make an earnest and fervent application of the Gospel to the heart and soul of their hearers. Let them proceed upon the basis of sound doctrine, elucidate the Scripture in its native and proper meaning, and with all fervour and ardour and unction, endeavour to impress it on the heart. They wanted what Mr. Jay had so happily described in a letter, where he said that by placing old truths in new connexions they would give to oldness or sameness the effect of novelty. Here it was that all the powers of taste and elegance and style were required to place the Gospel in an interesting aspect. There was one very important point to which he must refer, though he did it with some hesitation, namely, the instructions which were given by tutors to the rising ministry under their care. He was happy to be able to state his belief that there was no failure in this important particular. Having laboured six-and-twenty years in this department at Rotherham College, he had ever made it his chief endeavour to instruct his younger brethren directly from the Scriptures. There were probably nearly a hundred brethren then labouring in the ministry of the Gospel, who were experiencing whatever advantages his instructions could confer. He believed that the same course had been pursued generally by those who had been entrusted with the office of tutor. With regard to social prayer amongst the ministers of the Gospel, which had been touched upon with such tact, skill, and impressiveness by the brother who had addressed them from the pulpit on Tuesday evening, he thought its importance could not possibly be overrated, seeing that the success of their ministry must be derived in so great a measure from the tone and temper of their own minds. They might expect that the Holy Spirit would be communicated, and that their zeal as ministers would be called into lively, active, and vivid action, by the exercises of devotion; and the connexion between the two could not be too constantly borne in mind. For himself, having been so long engaged in the work of training the ministers of the Gospel, he could not but rejoice in the spectacle which he beheld. He felt a confident hope that sound doctrine would be preserved by those who had the care of the churches; and that pure morals would be exemplified and inculcated by eminent men who would be the ornament of literature, and the guides of the church. Notwithstanding the storms and tempests by which they were agitated, there rose in the vista a brighter prospect—the prospect of a day when “the kingdoms of this world should become the kingdoms of their Lord and of his Christ.”

The Rev. R. W. HAMILTON, of Leeds, said—I quite sympathise in the regret of the mover of this resolution in being called upon to second its adoption; but I have been requested to undertake this, in circumstances which forbade all refusal. I know not why I, in particular, have been called to this position, save that he who did so invoke me was, perhaps, a little privy to certain correspondence which has passed upon periodical views of Christianity. I shall express myself in no more tangible shape. I do think that there have been presented, in some of our periodical organs,

views which are not calculated either to raise our character or to promote our orthodoxy. If I may allude to any experience of my own, I should say, that amidst all the folly, all the levity, and something worse, of my academical course, I have still retained the taste which I formerly acquired for the old theology. I love its racy English—to this hour—and shall be very sorry if any of that salt be allowed to evaporate from us, notwithstanding all the advantage which may be derived from hermeneutics, and the general principles of criticism. As we go on in life, we climb a hill; our prospect becomes more clear than before; but I value the hill, not so much for the prospect, as for the stability which it affords. Now that I am entering upon the second half century of my life, I would not say one word, by way of appeal, to those who are fifty or fifty-one; but I would turn to those who are somewhat less; and, taking them aside, would open to them a brother's heart—a brother still, though a little senior to themselves. I never was carried away by any love of American divinity. President Davies and President Edwards, surely, must be to our taste, if we know anything at all of the value of our principles; but when I mention any subsequent names—with the exception, indeed, of that of Dr. John Mason—it is but as dwindled lights, and sometimes, I think, smoking tapers. And we are to barter all our divinity for that which is of American growth! No, not American, but German-anti-supernaturalism, imported *viâ* America. In Germany it was associated with chairs all but notoriously infidel; but, unhappily, coming through America, worked up in the books of divines there, though it may not have been intended, it has certainly inflicted an injury upon the fair fame of our body as regards its scriptural theology. Let us act ingenuously. I believe the evangelical clergy of the Established church—those who are faithful, I mean, among the faithless—suspect that there is, in this matter, a retrograde movement on our part; and my conviction is, that there is colour for the charge. I may be wrong—I am not good enough, or wise enough, to be the adviser of my brethren; but I am too good and too wise to be the accuser of my brethren. I say this before their face; I could never whisper it behind their back. I have, however, found some of my younger brethren—not to make myself very venerable for age—who would say, “we think the text means this, or think it only means this,” and then absolutely, with a sort of “Eureka, Eureka,” they would rejoice to think that they had gained the lower meaning. I say the lower meaning is *prima facie* the improbable meaning. The lower meaning is the meaning which is to be set aside. I would rather take the word transcendently, and say, “If there is anything divine, we ought to be impressed rather on that side, than on the side of the earthly and grovelling.” Now, as I have before remarked, I have found this existing, and I have been interrogated in reference to it. My brethren have said, in regard to some of the most awful passages of Holy Writ, “I think it does not intend any more than this: why should it intend more?” I have sometimes said to those who have talked in this manner, “Do observe the style of the interpretation which you are adopting.” It is vicious in the outset; it gives the preference to that which is “of the earth, earthy.” I should be unfaithful, Sir, to my own conscience, unfaithful to the denomination with which my best wishes, my best hopes, and my best affections are connected, if I decline to give utterance to these thoughts. I know Augustin is much abused because he said, “*Credo quia impossibile.*” I do not justify the exact phrase, but I believe there is sound reason in it. Here is a Divine Intelligence suggesting that which no human mind could ever have suggested; and I have no hesitation in saying, that the impossibility, instead of being a stumbling-block, is my inducement to believe. I would also make one remark, as to the Antinomianism of which we have been so much afraid. I do believe that I have sometimes been afraid of preaching the entire, the fullest view of truth, lest the Antinomian should find his pabulum in it, or say, “This is the

Gospel
Antine
of the
them
nay G
grudge
nation
We ha
princi
Evil w
shrink
us as
the wh
the ac
not in
that I
passin
think
displa
loppin
and es
I do p
(I kno
hardly
procee
Home
that I
dear y
allowe
symbo
ment,
but I
have d

The
or two
heard
Christ
do abo
be wo
with a
affecte
part w
import
truths
was pe
old th
not be
were a
were c

The
had b

N.

Gospel," while he allowed the term to nothing beside. There is nothing like stifling Antinomianism, suffocating Antinomianism, by the sound, irreproachable preaching of the truth. Let us cut off occasion from those who seek occasion. Let none of them be able to say that they shall starve, or that we preach to them a "yea and nay Gospel;" I believe that is a Hawkerian phrase. Let them not say that we grudge or stint the faith "once delivered to the saints." The glory of our denomination has been the preaching of the simple and entire compass of Christian truth. We have preached it in its experience, but we have never been afraid of the doctrinal principles; even in its more abstract shape and form we have met with our enemies. Evil will be the day, dark will be the hour, if any of our brethren, young or old, shall shrink from the firmness of our forefathers, that firmness which has characterised us as a denomination. Independent as I am, Independency, Congregationalism, all the whole machinery and apparatus, would go for nothing in my esteem, but as it is the scaffolding to that which is the vital truth, the "truth as it is in Jesus." I will not intrude myself any longer upon the attention of the meeting. I believe, however, that I am speaking articulately and precisely the thoughts and feelings which are passing in almost every heart and intellect around me. Permit me to say that I think there is a spirit amongst some of us which ought to be firmly withstood. It displays itself, not in denying Christianity, but in putting it upon a Procrustean bed, lopping it away, cutting it down, and making it palatable to the temper of the age, and especially to our better-educated and informed young people. Now against that I do protest. We find so many of our young men who are quite full of hermeneutics, (I know the meaning of the word, but I believe it comes from the lips of many who hardly possess even that degree of knowledge)—these young men are many of them proceeding in a fashion and at a rate which I verily believe would have puzzled Homer and Demosthenes and Cicero; and they have such enlightened views of truth that I really do not think they know in fact what they believe. I believe that these dear youths are few, but I hope that before they are admitted to the high places, or allowed to have any consideration among us, we shall test their orthodoxy, not by symbols, but by the New Testament. Let us say to them, "Here is the New Testament, that is my religion. I will read it with you, either in English or in the original, but I do not think that any of your interpretations, from whatever quarter derived, have done anything to add to the common stock of truth."

The Rev. R. VAUGHAN, D.D., of the Lancashire College, said he wished to say one or two words in reference to the dreaming system imported from Germany. He had heard young men in the ministry speak as though it were a kind of honour done to Christianity, that such men as Emerson and Carlyle should speak in the terms they do about the Saviour and Christianity. Honour done to Christianity that it should be wounded with a bow, and betrayed with a kiss! He would rather have to deal with a direct enemy, who denounced the whole system, than with a crafty one, who affected to receive it in part only, that he might neutralise the more effectually that part which he disliked. He wholly sympathised in what had been said as to the importance of preaching fully the old truths of the Gospel. In setting forth these truths, however, they must not forget that they had to do with a state of mind which was peculiar to their own times; they must study that mind in order to adapt this old theme to the new forms of difficulty which they had to encounter. They should not be thought to be so much occupied in exposing the folly of the absurdities that were afloat, as in building up their own sublime truth, leaving the absurdities that were opposed to it to perish as a natural consequence.

The Rev. J. A. JAMES said—he felt personally implicated in the remarks which had been made on the subject of American divinity. He had, in reference to this

subject, stood in good company, though it appeared that that did not always secure he being right. When he had found his name associated with one of the most correct, discriminating, and recondite theologians of the day, and of the old school too, Dr. Payne, who had been held up that very morning as an authority—he had certainly felt that he could not be wrong in recommending Mr. Finney's book on Revivals. However, Dr. Payne was not infallible, and he was sure he (Mr. James) was not; and he would honestly avow that although the preface recommending this book was prepared with great caution, and with the intention of preserving the readers from error, he regretted that it had ever been written. He must join, too, in what had been said as to the necessity for caution with regard to some of their younger brethren. He himself had had to deal with one young man who had fallen into an error which he conceived to be the great tendency of the present day, by enforcing man's responsibility, without sufficiently taking into account the Divine sovereignty, and the work of the Holy Spirit. There was a period in their history when the tendency of their divines lay in an opposite direction. In sweeping away the rubbish of former times, they had been in some danger of touching fundamental truths. It must now be recollected that there was not only a power of the Spirit in the word, but a power of the Spirit *with* the word, and that if that were left out, they would be denying the doctrine of the Divine influence. That was a tendency of the present day against which he hoped their young men would studiously guard.

It being 12 o'clock, the business was suspended, as on the previous day, to allow time for a devotional service of singing and prayer, in which the Rev. Professor SCOTT, of Airedale College, and the Rev. J. SCOTT, of Cleckheaton, prayed.

The discussion was then resumed and continued until nearly two o'clock, when both the memorial and appeal were adopted by the following resolution:

That this assembly adopts the declaration now read, for the purpose of publishing and placing on record its solemn sense, not only of the essential truth and unchangeable importance of the great doctrines of the Gospel, as held by the Independent churches from their origin, but of the peculiar necessity that, in the present remarkable times, those doctrines should be maintained with watchful fidelity, and preached with fulness and ardour in the Congregational churches of this country.

The Rev. T. SCALES, as chairman of the sub-committee on the subject of education, read a list of names which had been drawn up for approval. Some other routine business having been completed, the Rev. J. A. JAMES closed the sitting with prayer.

DINNER.

The ministers and lay gentlemen present again dined together after the sitting of this day, at East-parade Chapel; the attendance being no less numerous than on the previous day. The Rev. R. W. HAMILTON, of Leeds, presided.

After the cloth had been drawn, the Chairman said it had been affirmed on the previous day that none could exceed in loyalty the Protestant dissenters of this kingdom. From his heart he believed, and would avouch that they were the most loyal of her majesty's subjects. Theirs was free, spontaneous loyalty. They were equally loyal, come smile, come frown; come storm, or come fair weather. Whether at court or not, their fealty was true as the dial to the sun, although it might not be shone upon. He begged to propose the health of her majesty Queen Victoria—not with the honours, for they wanted no noisy effusions to testify their loyalty to their sovereign.

The Chairman then proposed Success to the Congregational Union of England and Wales. He had always approved and admired the principles of that institution. It

was only necessary that it should be extensively known and well understood, in order to insure its being well appreciated and universally supported.

The Rev. A. WELLS moved that the Rev. John Ely should be received into the Union.

The Rev. Dr. MATHESON seconded the resolution, which was carried unanimously.

The Rev. THOMAS SCALES said—their Union was now perfect, as far as the town of Leeds was concerned. He hoped that the example which had been set, would be followed by numbers of the brethren in that county, who had not yet joined the Union. There were, he believed, in all, about one hundred and fifty churches in that county. The ministers of sixty of them had been spectators of their proceedings. He trusted that both churches and pastors would unite themselves, as speedily as possible, to the Congregational Union, which had been the instrument of such immense good to their denomination and to their country.

The Rev. A. WELLS said—it should always be remembered that what they chiefly wanted was the adhesion, not merely of ministers, but of ministers and churches conjointly. It was from such adhesions as these that the most beneficial results might be anticipated.

The following gentlemen were then admitted into the Union:—Rev. J. S. Pearsall, Andover; Revs. J. Ely and W. Hudswell, Leeds; Rev. Walter Scott, Airedale College, Bradford; Rev. H. Wight, Carlisle; Rev. J. Waddington, Stockport; Rev. J. G. Miall, Bradford; Rev. Robert Massie, Newton; Rev. J. Bramhall, Stainland; Rev. B. Beddow, Barnsley; Rev. D. Jones, Booth; Rev. James Scott, Cleckheaton.

The Rev. THOMAS SCALES said, he held in his hand a resolution which he should submit to the Meeting with unfeigned pleasure and delight. It referred to their excellent and reverend friend, (the Rev. J. Reynolds,) who had with so much ability, with so much urbanity, and with so much gentlemanly feeling, presided over their proceedings. They would all feel with him that he was richly entitled to their thanks for the important services which had been rendered by him to the Union in the capacity of Chairman.

The Rev. Dr. VAUGHAN, in seconding the resolution, said—it might not be known to the majority of those who were present, that their esteemed brother was a convert not merely to the Congregational Union, but to Congregationalism itself; having become so in circumstances which involved a large amount of sacrifice, and exhibited a perception of the majesty of principle and of truth, to which they should be prepared to do sincere homage. He had left a department, as it were, of the ecclesiastical world, in which he might have realised honour and emolument, in order to throw himself into associations, in which he was cut off from the intercourse to which he had been accustomed from youth, and to cast in his lot among them. It was delightful to look back upon his conduct for two-and-twenty years—the period during which he had had some knowledge of his character—and to see him now, comparatively in the evening of his life, surrounded by a body of ministers who could feel the worth of Christian principles. Long might he be spared to serve the cause of that truth which was dear to him in common with all Christians, and to maintain those principles for which he had been prepared to suffer, and had actually suffered, with the cheerfulness and dignity proper to the Christian man.

The resolution passed by acclamation.

The Rev. J. REYNOLDS said it would be the height of affectation to say, that he was not deeply sensible of the honour which had been conferred upon him. Affected, too, he must indeed be, or he would have neither the feelings of a man nor of a Christian. He rejoiced—and believed that he should do so in his dying hour—that the providence of God had cast his lot among the Nonconformists. It was his growing conviction that they were right in principle; that they had the word of God on

their side; that they had the tokens of God's presence and favour resting upon their proceedings; and that if they continued to maintain the principles which they held, and which separated them from the church, in the spirit of the Gospel, they must eventually insure for them universal prevalence. With regard to himself, he had already said at the annual meeting in May, that the position he had occupied as Chairman of their proceedings, was the highest point at which his ambition could aim. He now felt that he owed them the deepest debt of gratitude for the kind construction which they had put upon his imperfect discharge of the duties of that office.

The Rev. J. ELY proposed the following resolution:

That this Meeting feels it to be its duty to record the deep and solemn impression produced by the faithful and truly pastoral address delivered before the ministers and brethren assembled in Belgrave Chapel, by the Rev. THOMAS BINNEY, and to express their earnest desire and request, that Mr. Binney will allow it to be printed for the benefit of this Union.

The Rev. J. A. JAMES seconded the resolution, which was carried unanimously.

The Rev. T. BINNEY said—he could not but feel thankful to God that his effort to serve the Union had been so kindly received. He had some doubts, however, of the propriety of printing the discourse; it had not, he feared, been prepared with sufficient care, to justify such a step. If the Meeting, however, would consent to leave the matter with himself, he would consider whether or not it would be desirable to publish, and act accordingly.

J. CONDER, Esq., proposed the following resolution:

That the ministers and brethren of the Congregational Union present avail themselves of this opportunity to tender to EDWARD BAINES, Jun., Esq., their cordial acknowledgments for his invaluable services in the cause of religious freedom; and more especially for his laborious statistical inquiries, by which so important a mass of information has been elicited with regard to the existing provision of the means of religious instruction and general education in the manufacturing districts.

GEORGE HADFIELD, Esq., of Manchester, seconded the resolution, which was carried unanimously.

E. BAINES, Esq., of Leeds, briefly acknowledged the resolution.

J. JAMES, Esq. (Mayor of Birmingham,) said, he rose for the purpose of proposing a resolution which required no support from him. Gratitude was prompt, and an expressive acknowledgment needed not many words to give it force. It was his happiness to serve the tables of the first provincial meeting held by the Union; it had been delightful to mark the progress of the Union since that occasion; but though it might be said of their Christian friends, in the different towns they had visited, "Many sisters have done virtuously," yet Leeds had excelled them all. In the arrangements made to secure the comfort of the delegates and ministers, nothing had been lost sight of; every thing displayed the most delicate attention. He had enjoyed the rites of hospitality on this occasion more than he had ever done before, and it was delightful to observe that the season had also been signalised by the manifest extension of the principles of the Congregational Union. On every account, then, he felt great delight at having been entrusted with the following resolution:

That the very cordial and hospitable reception afforded to the ministers and delegates of the Congregational Union by their brethren at Leeds, calls for the expression of their warmest thanks, and the assurance of their affectionate and fraternal regard to the honoured ministers and brethren with whom they have on this occasion been brought into such happy communion and fellowship.

JAMES SPICER, Esq., of London, having seconded the resolution, it was carried unanimously.

The Rev. R. W. HAMILTON said—as the representative of the hospitalities of Leeds, perhaps it was not unfitting that he should rise to acknowledge the resolution. He would have been Gaius for the whole number, could he have found sufficient room; however, perhaps they had discovered greater hospitality elsewhere. They had found some difficulty in making their friends in Leeds understand what it was which they wanted them to do, but the moment they understood it, nothing could exceed the desire manifested to make all the necessary arrangements. He then proposed the following resolution, which was seconded by Rev. J. W. MASSIE, of Manchester:

That the thanks of the Meeting be presented to the Secretaries, the Rev. W. S. PALMER, and the Rev. A. WELLS, for their valuable and acceptable services throughout its proceedings; and the Meeting expresses deep regret for the loss of the presence and services of their beloved colleague, the Rev. J. BLACKBURN, which have so often added to the pleasure and success of former meetings of this Union; as well as its sympathy with Mr. Blackburn in the lamented indisposition which has rendered impossible his appearance among his brethren on this occasion.

The Meeting then separated.

ON THURSDAY EVENING, a public meeting in favour of our British Missions, was held in the spacious chapel of the Rev. J. Ely, East Parade, which was crowded by a most respectable and attentive auditory. James James, Esq., Mayor of Birmingham, in the chair. The blessing of God was implored by the Rev. HENRY WIGHT, of Carlisle.

After an introductory address from the Chairman, Dr. MATHESON, one of the secretaries, read the Memorial on the affairs of the Home Missionary Society, which is inserted at page 821.

The following resolution in favour of the Home Missionary Society, was thereupon moved by the Rev. J. J. FREEMAN, one of the Secretaries of the London Missionary Society, seconded by the Rev. HENRY WIGHT, of Carlisle, and unanimously adopted:—

1. That, in the judgment of this Meeting, the most strenuous efforts of the Congregational churches are at the present juncture needed for the spread of evangelical truth and piety among the neglected population of England, especially in those extensive rural districts which lie beyond the reach of the efforts of county and other associations, where gross ignorance and vice fearfully prevail, and false teaching and spiritual domination bear sway almost without check, and where an effective agency can be sustained only by a central society. And this Meeting feels constrained to express the opinion, that while the Home Missionary Society has, with too limited means, accomplished most extensive good, it has not yet been sustained in any adequate degree, by the Independent churches and their pastors, to whose increased attention and liberality the Meeting would earnestly commend this important institution.

The Rev. THOMAS JAMES, one of the Secretaries of the Irish Evangelical Society, then read a paper on the affairs of that institution, which is inserted at page 823.

The following resolution for the Irish Evangelical Society, was then moved by the Rev. J. A. JAMES, seconded by the Rev. Dr. VAUGHAN, and passed unanimously:—

2. That with whatever pain and alarm this Meeting may regard the social wrongs and agitations of Ireland, and whatever sentiments it may entertain in respect to past

or probable schemes of legislation for their redress, it feels bound to declare its conviction that nothing but the spread of the Gospel will ever raise and tranquillise the population of that deeply interesting country: and would therefore affectionately urge the Congregational churches of England to give increasing support to the Irish Evangelical Society, as an Institution that has been Divinely blessed during the operations of twenty-nine years, and which is still employing wise and scriptural means for the diffusion of the Gospel in Ireland, in harmony with their distinctive views of its truth, piety, and liberty.

The Rev. ALGERNON WELLS, one of the Secretaries of the Colonial Missionary Society, then read from its Committee the document which appears at page 826.

Upon this the following resolution for the Colonial Missionary Society was moved by the Rev. THOMAS BINNEY, one of the Secretaries of the Society, seconded by the Rev. JAMES GAWTHORN, of Derby, and adopted unanimously :—

3. That this Meeting regards the British Colonies as a scene of missionary enterprise with great interest and hope; it believes that in those fine regions, flourishing churches will rise and exert a powerful influence in maintaining truth and liberty among mankind, and in spreading the Gospel through the earth—and it regards the state of society and institutions in those settlements as presenting many advantages for the labours particularly of Congregational ministers; and with these views the Meeting cannot but deeply lament to learn that the operations of the Colonial Missionary Society are greatly impeded, because many churches never at all contribute to its funds, and others only in a scanty, irregular manner; and would therefore warmly recommend this branch of British missions to the cordial and liberal support of all the Independent churches.

Lastly, the resolution in favour of Simultaneous Collections on the 29th of October, was moved by the Rev. ALGERNON WELLS, seconded by the Rev. W. S. PALMER, as the two Secretaries of the Union present, and carried with entire unanimity.

4. That this Meeting, considering the importance and the necessities of these institutions for Missions to various sections of the British empire, would earnestly recommend to all the Independent churches, with their bishops and deacons, concurrence in the proposal for simultaneous collections in their behalf, on the last Lord's day in this month, and the utmost liberality on that occasion.

A vote of thanks to the Chairman was then passed with warm and unanimous feeling, on the proposal of the Rev. THOMAS BINNEY, to which the Chairman responded briefly but cordially. The numerous congregation then sang "Bless'd be the dear uniting love," &c., and the Rev. JOHN ELY closed the Meeting with prayer and the benediction.

FRIDAY MORNING. The large amount of business compelled the Assembly to hold a third morning sitting at the school-room of Queen-street Chapel. The usual devotional exercises were conducted by the Chairman.

CHAPEL DEBTS.

The Rev. A. WELLS briefly introduced this subject, which had been set apart as the first business for discussion. He said, there could, of course, be no difference of opinion as to the desirableness of getting rid of what was termed mendicancy, and the Committee had therefore prepared some practical suggestions with the view of securing that object. There were a number of points to which he might refer; he would only mention a few of them. In the first place, he entirely objected to any

scheme of centralization. He did not believe that they could gather, to any one point, either in London or the country, the general contributions of the churches for this object; and he did not think it would be desirable to do it if they could, for it would create a necessity for additional paid agency, which he thought would, on several grounds, be extremely objectionable, and not the least objection was, that it would involve the placing in the hands of one man a far greater amount of distribution of funds than he ought to be intrusted with. The plan which he had to propose was this:—he thought that the large towns generally should effect the object separately, and that London should do it according to the six metropolitan districts. The next thing to be considered, was the authentication of chapel deeds. How, for instance, was it possible for the friends at Leeds to know the merits of a case which came out of the far west? He believed that sums of money had often been given by benevolent friends upon the recommendation of highly valued ministers, when neither ministers nor donors knew anything at all of the trust upon which the chapel was held. He thought that this matter might, with great propriety, be entrusted to the board of Congregational ministers in London. This board so thoroughly sifted the chapel deeds which were sent to them, that if a case were recommended by them, no hesitation need be felt elsewhere. They never gave their sanction to a case unless the deeds themselves were sent to them for inspection, or without sending those deeds to Mr. Hull Terrell, their honorary solicitor, by whom they underwent a thorough scrutiny. The next point that occurred to him was this: in London they would not in the least know what was being done in the country generally, through local reports. In the case of Leeds or Liverpool there might be no difficulty, but as regarded the whole of England, local reports would be of very little use. He recommended, therefore, that all the reports should be advertised in the *Patriot*; that once a year, every chapel which had been approved by the Society, should put an advertisement in the *Patriot*, acknowledging what had been received. He had no doubt that the example of Liverpool would be generally followed; that each town or district would gradually adopt a settled plan, and that this would, in the course of time, become universal. It was necessary that they should do so were it only in self-defence: cases were often brought to London which never ought to have travelled out of the bounds of the districts from whence they came; and it struck him, that in order to meet the evil, some general plan was necessary, similar to that which he had mentioned. He had a strong persuasion, that while the course of the Congregational Union had, up to that time, been a course of documents, it must, in future, be a course of action. It might be still necessary to prepare documents as heretofore; but having endeavoured so long to instruct their brethren as to the principles and objects of the Union, they were now called upon to show one practical benefit which it was calculated to secure. As men of business, they must set to work with a firm determination to effect this object.

SAMUEL BLACKBURN, Esq., of Liverpool, said he had been entrusted by his brethren at Liverpool with a resolution on this subject. It was as follows:—

That in the judgment of this assembly, serious injury results to the Congregational churches throughout the country, from the debts now owing on so large a number of the places of worship belonging to the denomination. The lengthened separation in many cases of the pastor from his people, and the disappointment in most instances resulting to both parties from the comparative failure of the begging operations undertaken by the former, the encouragement to imprudent expenditure afforded by the want of a proper system for the erection of new chapels in destitute localities, and finally the heavy expenses attendant upon the present mode of securing funds for the liquidation of existing debts, and the erection of new chapels, are evils for the remedy of which a strenuous effort should at once be made.

The only question which could arise was as to the mode of providing: as to the desirableness of the object there could be but one opinion. He would move the adoption of the resolution which he had read.

J. CONDER, Esq., said—There were two distinct points to which the Committee must turn their attention, one retrospective and the other prospective. The first point to be kept in view was, how to get rid of the old debts; and the second, how to avoid the incurring of new ones. He thought that in any plan which might be adopted, they must take care to equalise the resources of the country. If this were not attended to, what would become of a district in which there was no Liverpool, Manchester, or Leeds? England should be so divided that no case would be allowed to travel out of its own district; while at the same time the large and wealthy towns would be able to assist special cases in other and poorer districts.

The Rev. JAMES ROBERTS, of Melton Mowbray, complained of the want of statistics of the Congregational body generally, in which it was inferior to many other religious bodies in this country. He would suggest that a schedule should be prepared for transmission to different parts of the country, containing columns for answers to such queries as the following:—the place, the minister's name, the population, whether the chapel has been enlarged, whether there is a house attached, or a burial-ground, whether there is a trust-deed, and if so, whether it is enrolled, what is the number of the trustees, the present debt, the number of the congregation, the number of the Sunday scholars, &c. He thought that such information would assist them in carrying out the project then under discussion.

The Rev. J. ROBINSON, of London, said, his principal objection to the plan adopted at Liverpool, was its apparent selfishness: here was a large wealthy population uniting to get rid of their own burdens, and leaving their poorer neighbours to struggle with their difficulties as they best could. All that they could do at present was to appoint a committee, who, by corresponding with the associations, would get from them such information as would enable them to propose a general plan of operations; and he had no doubt that they would devise measures which would obviate all objections.

The Rev. J. ROBERTS said, he hoped the committee would not forget the rural districts. Liverpool was now no city of refuge for them, and if Manchester and other towns followed its example, the rural districts would in time be entirely shut out. He felt as strongly as any one the evils of the present system, and was extremely anxious to see some efficient remedy adopted, which would include the whole denomination.

A conversation took place with respect to the validity of trust deeds. It was stated that great carelessness and irregularity were displayed in the drawing up of many of the chapel deeds at present. The facilities afforded by the Congregational Board for the correct drawing up of its deeds, were strongly impressed upon the Meeting by the Secretaries of the Union.

The practical suggestions offered to the Meeting were embodied in the following minute, in order that it might be referred to a committee nominated for that purpose:

First, It appears to this Meeting that societies for this great object should be formed in the larger towns, or in the associations for districts wherein no large towns are situated—an extensive centralization of effort being deemed inappropriate for this particular undertaking.

Secondly, That as the examination of the trust deeds of chapels for which contributions are solicited, is very necessary; and in respect of cases brought from a distance before committees of chapel fund societies, such committees may be sometimes unable to make the necessary inquiries, it is submitted whether, in such instances,

the recommendation of the London Congregational Board may not be acted upon, as that body has long adopted the practice of strictly inquiring into the provisions of trust deeds before giving its sanction to cases brought before it.

Thirdly, That as a safeguard against improper cases, and against improper and undue reliance on general assistance for discharging obligations incurred by erecting chapels, it be a general rule, that societies for this object assist no case from a district in which a chapel-assisting society does not exist, and has not sanctioned such case by a grant; or to which, by some other means, local assistance has not been so rendered as to show both the liberality of the district, and the merits of the case.

Fourthly, That to circulate and interchange information among such various chapel-assisting societies as may hereafter be formed, and by which their respective votes in favour of cases may be guided, it is recommended that the votes of every such society be advertised once a year in the *Patriot* newspaper, by the wide circulation of which journal this necessary intelligence will be generally known.

Fifthly, That some abstract or schedule of questions to be submitted for answer in all instances of applicant cases, be prepared and submitted for the consideration of those who may be engaged in forming or conducting associations in aid of chapel cases, in order to secure as much uniformity as may be desirable in the terms on which such assistance shall be afforded.

The Rev. A. WELLS moved, and SAMUEL BLACKBURN, Esq., of Liverpool, seconded the following resolution:—

That this assembly, having heard with satisfaction the statement now made respecting the principles and plans of the Liverpool Chapel Fund Association, refers the whole subject, with the foregoing practical recommendations, to a committee to be now appointed, with instructions to obtain the most complete statistical returns relating to the erection of chapels, and to chapel debts; and to prepare and publish plans and recommendations for the formation of chapel fund associations throughout the Independent denomination.

NEW MAGAZINE.

The next question brought before the Meeting, was the establishment of a new cheap magazine under the auspices of the Union. The project has been discussed at several previous meetings, and a committee was appointed at the annual assembly in May last, to ascertain and report to the Meeting what would be the best mode of procedure, and who might advantageously be engaged as the editor.

The Rev. W. S. PALMER stated to the Meeting what steps had been taken in the interim, for the purpose of forwarding the object. Letters had been sent to all parts of the country for the purpose of ascertaining the general feeling on the subject, and also certain points connected with the new publication. The result was, that the overwhelming majority were found to be in favour of the new magazine. There was some difference of opinion, however, as to the price, some thinking that it should be a penny, others that it should be threepence, and so on up to sixpence. The committee were now in doubt as to whether the price should be twopence or threepence, though, since the letters of Dr. Campbell in the *Patriot*, they rather inclined to the latter. The great difficulty, however, had been to get an editor. He was now happy to be able to inform the Meeting, that he had waited on Dr. Campbell, and had ascertained, that if the price were fixed at threepence, he would consent to be the editor.

A gentleman in the meeting suggested that the profits of the new magazine should go to the widows of ministers.

The Rev. A. WELLS said, he believed the widows are already better provided for than the aged ministers. Throughout England there are many widows living upon better incomes than both husband and wife previously enjoyed.

The Rev. J. A. JAMES said, as the proposer of this magazine two years since, he had felt some anxiety to see the project brought into speedy operation; he was happy to learn, therefore, that so bright and cheering a prospect was then opened before them. What he had desired to see established was a publication which should circulate widely, not merely amongst the *élite*, but amongst the mass of their members. They wanted a publication which should take hold of the multitude—a thing for the million—a work for the lower classes, who were becoming more and more intelligent through the instruction given in the Sunday-schools, but which, at the same time, should not be despised by the higher, if they chose to read it. They wanted that which was the perfection of preaching—a publication which would meet the taste of the higher, and yet be within the comprehension and intellect of the lower classes. They did not want a work which was bitterly controversial. If they set out with offensive sectarianism, they would ruin their denomination. Let the work be strictly denominational; let the principles of the denomination pervade it; let those principles come out as their religion, and not simply as their politics; and let there be a rich infusion of all that was elevated in the tone of piety; and he felt sure that they would secure an extended circulation for this magazine. He would have proposed that the price should have been twopence, believing that it would have a wider circulation in proportion; but he would most willingly forego his own opinion on that subject, in order to secure the editorship of Dr. Campbell. With him as the editor, he considered the thing as accomplished; and thought there could not be a doubt of success. Much would remain indeed to be done by pastors, and the success even of Dr. Campbell's editorship would depend greatly on their exertions. He thought there was often a want of that enthusiasm which might be expected in matters which closely concerned themselves, but he trusted that the present would be an exception to the rule. The rev. gentleman concluded by moving the following resolution, which was seconded by the Rev. Dr. VAUGHAN, of Manchester, and carried:—

That upon the report now presented by the Secretaries of the present position of the proposal for a new Magazine, this Meeting most respectfully and affectionately requests the Rev. Dr. Campbell to edit the projected periodical, in connexion with the Congregational Union of England and Wales—the Meeting acceding to the views of Dr. Campbell, as now reported, in respect to the price and size to be adopted for the magazine; and entertaining sanguine hope of its extensive success and usefulness, under the direction of so accomplished and indefatigable an editor.

THE REGIUM DONUM.

The Rev. J. MASSIE said he had been entrusted by his brethren both at Manchester and Ashton with a resolution relating to the *regium donum*. It was to the following effect:—

That this Meeting fully concurs in those principles and views which lead to an almost universal and a very strong desire, prevalent throughout the denomination, that no ministers connected with the Congregational churches should any longer be recipients of the Regium Donum; and entertains confident hope that early and effective measures will be adopted to enable the denomination to repudiate all participation in the grant, without depriving any minister of assistance derived from this source.

The statement which had been recently put forth as to £1700 being the amount received, was taken from an official document issued some years ago. The whole sum being divided into three parts, Dr. Pye Smith had informed him that £530 was the amount which he received, and this was presumed to be an equal third of the entire sum distributed. The parliamentary grant was £1862, whilst in fact only

£1590 was received; the rest went, he presumed, to officials. Now would it not raise them in the esteem of the public, and give a weight to their argument in opposition to the state religion, if they refused to receive this pitiful and paltry sum? He knew many persons who were willing to give £1 per annum, in order that the £500 might be relinquished; and he could not doubt that the general feeling of the denomination was so hostile to the receiving of this grant, that little difficulty would be experienced in getting rid of it.

J. CONDER, Esq., in seconding the resolution, said, the Meeting were aware that the Congregational Board, in 1837, protested against this grant; they had done so again and again; but the difficulty had always been that not only did the government wish them to retain it, but the distributors also felt that they could not be absolved from their trust. They must be prepared with a substitute. It appeared to him that one of two courses might be pursued. They might either appoint a number of gentlemen to form a committee, and to take steps for raising £500 for seven years, or for some limited time; or they might raise a sum of money upon the principles of insurance, in which case any actuary could tell them what sum would be requisite. No one could depend upon the *regium donum*, because he believed no minister received it for two years together; therefore it was not a stipend or allowance to any particular persons. If fifty gentlemen would subscribe £100 for seven years, he believed the object would be accomplished.

The Rev. A. WELLS thought that they must not look to the appointment of a committee, so much as to private exertions, for the effecting of this object. He joined with all his heart in the resolution, and would willingly give his guinea annually to carry out the object.

The Rev. R. W. HAMILTON said, he thought the nature of this grant had frequently been misunderstood. It was originally given from the royal revenues which belonged to the king in person, and stood altogether on a different basis from ordinary state grants of money. It was a donative granted in consideration of the fact that the dissenters had been favourable to the Electress of Hanover; and he, although he objected strongly to their receiving it, notwithstanding that it admitted of this distinction, yet at the same time he thought it should not be confounded with stipends given to popish priests in the colonies, or to presbyterian ministers in Ireland. He altogether denied that the cases were similar.

J. CONDER, Esq., said, he perfectly concurred in the distinction which Mr. Hamilton had drawn, and had endeavoured again and again to impress it upon the public. The grant now rested, he believed, on the same ground as that to Maynooth.

The Rev. R. W. HAMILTON said, it was a donation on the part of the House of Hanover.

The Rev. W. S. PALMER said, it was strictly a gift from the privy purse; and he had felt anxious, for the sake both of those who administered and those who received the fund, that in any declaration which they might issue on the subject, this fact should be clearly and fairly stated.

The Rev. J. A. JAMES said, whatever opinion might be entertained as to the history of this donative, but one feeling could exist as to the desirableness of their getting rid of it. Let some circulars on the subject be distributed, and he had no doubt that means would be found to release them from this stigma. This was necessary to enable them to enter into the grand conflict which was approaching. They would not go to it with clean hands if they did not entirely discard this grant.

The resolution was then adopted.

PERSECUTION AT MADEIRA.

The Rev. J. W. MASSIE brought before the attention of the Meeting the recent infringements of religious liberty by continental governments under popish influence,

especially the invasion of Tahiti by the French, and the imprisonment of Dr. Kalley, in Madeira, by the Portuguese government, instigated by the Romish priests. The Meeting avowed and recorded its sentiments on this painful subject by adopting the following resolution, moved by Mr. MASSIE, and seconded by Mr. CONDER.

That this Meeting cannot separate without an expression of deep regret, that the governments of Europe should, in so many cases, under the influence of men hostile to religious liberty, interfere with the free preaching of the Gospel, and otherwise infringe the rights of conscience; and especially would it notice with poignant grief the aggressions of France in the South Seas, and the intolerance of Portugal in Madeira, as indications of a renewed conflict betwixt papal intolerance and protestant principles and rights. That this Meeting would express its fraternal sympathy with Dr. Kalley in his present sufferings for the sake of the Gospel, and would devoutly commend him to the grace of God, that he may be kept faithful to evangelical truth and the service of Jesus. The Meeting would also assure Dr. Kalley of its readiness to co-operate with the friends of religious freedom on his behalf, and in the exposure of that persecuting spirit by which his self-denying and devoted labours in furtherance of the Gospel have been impeded.

The Rev. R. W. HAMILTON then closed this most delightful series of meetings with thanksgiving and prayer. The brethren who had been able to remain to the close of the proceedings, then separated with the impression, that this adjourned autumnal meeting of the Union at Leeds had reached an interest and importance even higher than former similar occasions had realised.

HACKNEY THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY AND SOCIETY FOR THE PROPAGATION OF THE GOSPEL.—The Fortieth Anniversary of this important institution was held at Hackney, Middlesex, on Wednesday, November 15th, 1843.

During the past year the purchase of the freehold of the seminary premises has been completed, and fourteen studies and as many sleeping-rooms erected, and the whole building rendered uniform, at an expense of about £3500.

For the purpose of acknowledging the goodness of God, in the completion of this undertaking, and of imploring his blessing on the future operations of the society, a devotional service was held in the afternoon in the lecture-room of the seminary. Prayers were offered by the Revs. H. J. Rook, T. Timpson, and E. Mannering, and addresses delivered by the Revs. Mark Wilks, of Paris, Arthur Tidman, and Thomas Heath, Missionary from the South Seas; all of whom, with the exception of Mr. Mannering, had been educated in the seminary. The speakers referred, with much emotion, to the advantages they had derived from the institution; to the Divine goodness in continuing the Rev. George Collison, as theological and resident tutor, from the foundation of the seminary, a period of forty years; to the improvements that had been made in the building; and to the claims of the society on the liberal support of the friends of the Redeemer.

At the close of this exercise the subscribers and friends present inspected the new erections, with which they expressed themselves much gratified, after which a numerous company took tea together.

The annual meeting was held in the evening in Well-street Chapel, J. G. Stapelton, Esq., Treasurer, in the chair. The Report was read by the Rev. J. E. Richards, Secretary, and its adoption moved and seconded by the Rev. S. H. Seaborn, and Frederick Smith, Esq. The Rev. J. Leifchild, D.D., then delivered an excellent discourse from Malachi ii. 6, 7. The devotional services were conducted by the Revs. J. Adey and H. J. Rook.

More than one hundred and thirty ministers have been introduced into the Christian church by this institution; four students have completed their studies during the year; two of whom (Messrs. Gill and Powell) are about to proceed to the islands of the South Seas, making fourteen missionaries that have been furnished to the London Missionary Society from this seminary, without putting that valuable institution to any expense for their board and education.

The Committee earnestly solicit donations towards defraying the expense incurred by the alterations and enlargement of the seminary premises, which were most important for the health and comfort of the students.

OPENING OF NEW CHAPELS.

On Thursday, the 13th of July, a neat and commodious chapel was opened for the use of the Independent or Congregational dissenters, at Welbury, in the North Riding of Yorkshire, when two sermons were preached; that in the afternoon by the Rev. J. Croft, of Ripon, on the "Last Judgment;" that in the evening by the Rev. John Elrick, A.M., of Northallerton, who preached from Heb. iii. 6, "Whose house are we!" The devotional exercises were conducted by Mr. H. Howard, of Pickering Academy, the student then supplying Appleton Wiske. On the following Lord's-day, a sermon was preached by the Rev. James Fordman, of Stokesley. The congregations were large, and the collections liberal; since then, a Sabbath-school has been gathered, and the prospects are of an encouraging character. Welbury Chapel is connected with Appleton Wiske. The erection of this place of worship is the fruit of the energetic zeal and liberality of M. Frowsdale, Esq.; and it is fondly hoped, that this additional effort which he has made, to extend the kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, will be crowned with a rich and permanent blessing.

A new chapel was opened at Didmorton, Gloucestershire, on the 13th September last, under auspicious circumstances. The preachers upon the occasion were Mr. Jay, of Bath; Mr. Knill, of Wotton-under-Edge; and Mr. Newman, of Shortwood. It has long been the wish of the lovers of the Gospel in the neighbourhood, to establish an evangelical ministry in this parish; but, until now, all their efforts have failed. Many a time the attempt has been made; but the persons who opened their houses for the preaching of the Gospel, were obliged to close them again, or quit their premises. At length, through the vigorous and disinterested conduct of two excellent young men, a piece of land was purchased, and the chapel erected, at the expense of about £400. These diligent tradesmen took upon themselves the whole responsibility; thus preventing delay, and insuring payment to all the persons employed. This was done by them, however, not with the intention of ultimately bearing the whole burden, but with the hope that they would be sanctioned in their endeavours by the contributions of friends, who are anxious to promote the spread of the Gospel in the dark parts of our land.

October 18th, a neat little stone building, twenty-four feet by thirty-four feet, and sixteen feet high, was opened as a Home Mission Chapel and British School, at South Witham, Lincolnshire, by the Rev. George Smith, of Poplar, London, who preached on the occasion. The Rev. W. Smith, of Wymondham, through whose instrumentality this chapel has been built, preached on the following Lord's-day, October 22nd. It was on August 21, 1842, Mr. Smith entered this village in company with a friend, and preached for the first time in the open air to about twelve people, it raining all the while. But on going a second time his congregation was much larger; he hired a house for preaching, which was so uncomfortably crowded, that the thought of building was suggested by two gentlemen, who offered to give

towards its erection five pounds each. There being no school in, or near the village, Mr. Smith suggested the desirableness of uniting the two objects, and instituting a British school; which was readily agreed to. A subscription was proposed, which has been most liberally met by all parties, so that the place will not be encumbered with debt. The Rev. T. Islip, of Stamford, in connexion with his kind and liberal people, has afforded much encouragement to this rising interest. On Monday, October 23rd, a school of forty children was opened under the superintendence of Mr. Thomas, a master from the Borough-road, with whom the British School Society sent a valuable grant of books for the day-school. The prospects are very encouraging, and there is ample room, as well as great need of an efficient school and extensive Home Mission operations in this neighbourhood.

In this Magazine for September, the ordination of a pastor over the missionary church at Howden Pans, is recorded. A correspondent has supplied the following particulars of its history, which strikingly illustrate the utility of a denominational Home Missionary society that is able and willing to assist in the formation of new congregations in destitute districts.

Howden Pans is a village in the parish of Wallsend, on the banks of the Tyne, with a population of from twelve to fourteen hundred souls. Two congregations of Methodists have assembled in this place for a number of years, and there is reason to hope that their labour has not been in vain. The operations of Divine grace are not confined to one denomination; and it will be found in the day of the Lord that trees of righteousness planted by the great Husbandman, and watered by the influence of Heaven, have brought forth fruit to the glory of God in every section of the church of Christ. But, though the inhabitants of Howden could not be said to be destitute of religious instruction, as many of them were neglecting the great salvation and attending no place of worship, they were often visited on week-day evenings by the Rev. Mr. Stowell, then of North Shields, the Rev. Mr. Reid, of Newcastle, and other ministers. By their occasional labours, some friends of evangelical religion, a few of whom were members of Independent churches, expressed an earnest desire to have the ordinances of the Gospel steadily administered among them. To obtain this, they applied to the Durham and Northumberland Association of Ministers, who, being convinced of the importance of the station, of the want of the Gospel in the parish church, and of the prospect of usefulness, they applied to the Directors of the Home Missionary Society to appoint a suitable preacher to proclaim the glad tidings of salvation to the people in Howden. They readily granted this request, and under their patronage, and at the desire of the Associated Ministers, the Rev. Mr. Caldwell was engaged to supply the place, and he commenced his labours in Howden in March, 1834. On the 30th of that month, Mr. Reid opened a place that had been fitted up for the stated worship of God, but it was soon found to be too small for the congregation, and in a few weeks a larger place was obtained. After several meetings of the congregation, they resolved to build a chapel, the foundation of which was laid on the 24th of February, 1835, by Ralph Walters, Esq., of Newcastle, a member of the Established Church, but a lover of all good men. The Rev. Mr. Jack, of North Shields, delivered a suitable address to the people, and Rev. Mr. Reid offered up a fervent prayer for the Divine blessing.

On the 8th of June, 1835, the chapel was opened for public worship. The Rev. Mr. Jack preached in the morning, and the Rev. Mr. Richardson, of Sunderland, in the evening. This being Whit-Monday, the congregation was excellent. On the following Sabbath Mr. Caldwell commenced his stated labours in the chapel, and he preached three times every Sabbath in Howden, or in some of the surrounding villages, as long as health and strength permitted; in addition to which he preached

or held public meetings generally four or five nights in the week: and it is to be hoped that the word of the Lord did not return void. On Sabbath evening, Nov. 8th, 1835, the pastor having previously examined a number of candidates for church fellowship, a Congregational church was formed in the chapel, and about twenty members gave each other the right hand of fellowship, and fervent prayers were offered to the God of all grace that they might be enabled to walk in love, and keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. On the 6th of December, Mr. Caldwell dispensed the ordinance of the Lord's supper to his infant church for the first time. He continued his labours as pastor of the church till the beginning of the year 1842, when he felt himself unable, after forty years of public labours, to perform any longer the duties incumbent on him, and he resigned his office, much to the regret of the church and congregation. During the whole time of his ministry the church enjoyed peace and harmony. In the course of these few years, eighty persons had been received into the fellowship of the Gospel, and nothing but growing infirmities induced him to give up his charge. It would be improper to finish this short account of the Independent Church in Howden without taking notice of the liberality of the Home Missionary Society to the cause of Christ in that place. But for their friendly aid, there is reason to suspect that no chapel would have been built, and no church would have been organised in Howden till the present day. The Directors supported the cause at first, contributed liberally for the building of the chapel, and continued to assist the church as long as they required their aid, which, happily, is no longer necessary.

ORDINATIONS, ETC.

On Wednesday, August 2nd, 1843, the Rev. Richard Penman was recognised as pastor of the church and congregation assembling in Bethel Chapel, Chester-le Street, Durham. The services were commenced by the Rev. Mr. Anderson, of Easington-lane, with prayer and reading the Scriptures; the introductory discourse was delivered by the Rev. Mr. Campbell, M.A., of Newcastle-on-Tyne; the recognition prayer was offered by the Rev. Mr. Caldwell, an intimate friend and colleague companion of Mr. Penman's father; the charge was delivered by the Rev. Mr. Jack, of North Shields. In the evening, an ordination of deacons took place, when a charge was addressed to them by the Rev. Mr. Froggatt, of Morpeth; and afterwards the Rev. Mr. Reid, of Newcastle-on-Tyne, preached to the people. Mr. Penman's settlement at Chester-le-street has been welcomed with the utmost cordiality on the part of the people, and his prospects of usefulness are of an encouraging kind.

The spiritual destitution of Wheatley, Oxon, a village containing 1000 souls, and with the parish about 1500, has long engaged the attention of the Independent church at Oxford; and recently, by the united efforts of that church, of the Oxford and West Berks Association and the Home Missionary Society, a neat chapel was opened, capable of seating 250 persons. On Wednesday, the 4th of October, 1843, Mr. Charles Davies was ordained to the work of the ministry at Wheatley. The Rev. E. Neale read the Scriptures and prayed; the Rev. H. Holmes, of Wendover, delivered the introductory discourse; Rev. W. Harris, of Wallingford, offered the ordination prayer; and the Rev. Eliezer Jones, of Oxford, gave the charge to Mr. Davies, who was one of the first converts of his own ministry. In the evening the Rev. J. Howell prayed, and the Rev. T. G. Hamper, of Uxbridge, preached from 1 Cor. xvi. 10, "See that he may be with you without fear."

The Rev. Robert Thomas, A.M., late of Saddleworth, near Manchester, having received a cordial and unanimous invitation to the pastoral charge of the Congrega-

tional church, Upminster, Essex, removed thither last March. This settlement was publicly recognised on the 17th of October. The Rev. George Rogers, of Albany-road Chapel, Camberwell, introduced the service by reading the Scriptures and prayer; the Rev. R. Ferguson, of Stratford, briefly explained and justified the service, and asked the usual questions; the Rev. G. Clayton, of Walworth, offered up special prayer for the people and their new pastor; the Rev. J. Morison, D.D., of Chelsea, gave the charge to the minister; and the Rev. J. Leifchild, D.D., addressed the people. The Rev. A. Brown, of South Ockendon; the Rev. E. Dewhirst, of Billericay; and the Rev. Mr. Hill, of Chigwell Row, assisted in the devotional services of the day.

On Wednesday, the 18th of October, Mr. R. Bowman, late of Airedale College, was publicly set apart to the pastoral office over the church and congregation assembling in Bethel Chapel, Bishopwearmouth, as successor to the Rev. J. W. Richardson, recently removed to London. The Rev. S. Goodall, of Durham, introduced the service by reading the Scriptures and prayer; the introductory discourse was delivered by the Rev. J. Glendinning, of Huddersfield; the questions were proposed by the Rev. A. Reid, of Newcastle; the Rev. S. Watkinson, of Monkwearmouth, offered the ordination prayer; and the charge was delivered to the minister by the Rev. Walter Scott, president and theological tutor of Airedale College. In the evening the Rev. A. Jack, of North Shields, preached to the people. The Revs. C. Bingley, of Middlesbrough; W. Campbell, of Newcastle; R. Penman, of Chester-le-Street; J. Anderson, of Easington Lane; W. Day, of Sunderland; and P. Bowman, of North Shields, also took part on the occasion. The congregations were numerous and respectable, and the services highly interesting.

The ordination of Mr. B. Opie Bendall, late of Highbury College, as pastor of the Independent church at Kingswood, near Wotton-under-Edge, Gloucestershire, took place on Wednesday, October 18. The Rev. G. Wood, of Bristol, commenced the service by reading the Scriptures and prayer; the Rev. J. Glanville, of Kingswood, near Bristol, delivered the introductory discourse; the Rev. D. Thomas, of Wotton-under-Edge, asked the usual questions; the Rev. J. Lewis, of Wotton-under-Edge, offered the ordination prayer; the Rev. R. Knill, of Wotton-under-Edge, gave the charge to the minister; the Rev. Wm. Dove, of Falfield, concluded the service with prayer. In the evening a sermon was preached by the Rev. Wm. Jay, of Bath. The engagements of the day were deeply interesting and numerously attended.

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS.

Favours have been received since our last from the Rev. Drs. Jackson—J. P. Smith—W. Urwick—J. Matheson. Also from

Rev. Messrs. B. Brook—R. Bowman—Thomas Lee—W. Campbell—R. Elliott—J. Robinson—W. Harris—B. O. Bendall—H. Howard—T. Guyer—W. Smith—J. Sherman—R. Thomson—J. K. Foster—W. Owen—Thomas Stratten—R. Ashton—J. E. Richards—A. Wells.

W. Stroud, Esq., M.D.—Messrs. Daniel Pratt—Joseph Christy—S. W. Partridge. A Layman. V.

Many readers having expressed regret that the Brief Notes on Passing Events have been often omitted, the Editor intends to resume the same with the January number, and to continue them from month to month.

SUPPLEMENT
TO THE
CONGREGATIONAL MAGAZINE
FOR
1843.

ON THE SUPPOSED TENDENCIES OF DEMOCRACY TO
ROMANISM.

M. ALEXIS DE TOCQUEVILLE, member of the Chamber of Deputies in France, has published the second part of his able work, "On the Social Influence of Democracy," which of course has excited much attention in the United States of North America. An opinion to which he inclines, that there is a material tendency in Democracy to combine with Romanism, has called forth a powerful review from the pen of Professor Truman Post, of Illinois College, Jacksonville, which appeared in the last number of the "American Biblical Repository."* As that article examines alike the statistical facts and the philosophical principles on which this opinion rests, we are happy to transcribe that portion of it which relates to this deeply interesting question, and doubt not but that its perusal will gratify very many of our readers to whom that excellent American periodical is not accessible:—

"What are to be the religious and intellectual and social features of the democratic era, which is opening upon us, is among the vast questions M. De Tocqueville attempts to solve, or at least to penetrate with conjecture. The answer he gives to the first of these—that relating to the religious condition of the coming ages—seems to us alike opposed to the indications of providence, prophecy, and philosophy. History, and the laws of the human mind, appear to point to dissimilar and more cheering results; and when we turn from these pages to those of the sacred oracles, and walk along the illumined perspective of the

* For October, 1843.—No. 52.

future they disclose, we feel as if escaped from the dim cell of a St. Dominic, or the stifling gloom of the Sacred Office, into the blessed light of day.

We refer the reader to chapter vi., vol. ii., entitled 'Of the Progress of Roman Catholicism in the United States.' He concludes as follows: 'There ever have been, and ever will be, men, who, after having submitted some portion of religious belief to the principle of authority, will seek to exempt several other parts of their faith from its influence, and to keep the mind floating at random between liberty and obedience. But I am inclined to believe, the number of these thinkers will be less in democratic than other ages, and that our posterity will tend more and more to a single division into two parts, some relinquishing Christianity entirely, and others returning to the bosom of the Church of Rome.'

A startling conclusion truly. Most American readers would dismiss it with a shrug or a sneer, sorrowing at a weakness in a mind they are compelled to respect and admire, but as too palpably absurd to merit refutation. We shall not so treat it. The frequency with which such conclusions are drawn by Catholic writers, indicates some apparent foundation. Let us inquire, then, with the seriousness to which our author is entitled, whether the belief to which he 'is inclined' can be sustained by fact and logic. Is there a natural tendency in Democracy to combine with Romanism,—in civil liberty to ally itself with spiritual despotism?

We may find it at least instructive to observe, how a mind of such sagacity and candour has been led to a belief so wide from our own; and we may be sure, that the facts which have seemed to him adequate to authorise it, have in them what strongly claims our regard. By looking at chapters fifth and sixth, it will be found, that his opinions relative to the religious tendencies of democracy, are based, first, upon supposed facts observed in American society, and secondly, on the necessary tendencies of the human mind under the influence of democratic institutions; which tendencies he thinks explain those facts, and prove them to be a characteristic and legitimate result of Democracy.

First, then, let us look at his facts. Those failing, doubts at least will be cast over the philosophy that accounts for them. His sixth chapter opens with this startling enunciation: 'America is the most democratic country in the world, and it is at the same time (according to reports worthy of belief) the country in which the Roman Catholic belief is making most progress;' after which he significantly remarks, 'At first sight this is surprising.' To an American, I apprehend it will be both 'surprising' and new; or it argues poorly for the spread of Romanism in other countries. If we found representations of this kind in these volumes only, we should suppose the ecclesiastical con-

nexion of the author had unconsciously biased his judgment, and distorted the language of facts, if it had not led him to mistake wishes for facts. But the great candour of the author, and the uniform occurrence of such statements in Catholic writers relative to this country, will not permit us thus to account for them. Their uniformity proves them to be a part of a *system*. For instance, in Chateaubriand's 'Sketches of Modern Literature,' in connexion with facts and reasonings most novel and extraordinary, relative to the connexion between Romanism and civil liberty in Europe, we find it gravely asserted that 'most of the western states are now Catholic. The progress of this communion in the United States exceeds all belief. Here it has been invigorated in its evangelical element—popular liberty, while other communions decline in profound indifference!!' The facts and the argument will, we imagine, strike an American as equally 'surprising' and original. It is stated also in the 'Annales de la Propagation de la Foi' for June, 1839, 'In ten years the number of the faithful has increased one-third. In the Atlantic states they form a powerful minority. In the greater part of the western states they form a plurality, and at some points perhaps a majority of the inhabitants!!' This statement, though evidently phrased with a view to convey to the careless reader, more than the words strictly interpreted might hold the writer responsible for, will seem hardly less 'surprising' than the former. Such uniformity and persistency of misrepresentation seem to point to a systematic fraud somewhere, or to a singular consistency in delusion. It may arise in part from ignorance, but it looks like Jesuitism—like a deliberate imposture, practised by the Romish priesthood in this country on their patrons in Catholic Europe, or rather a fraud by the Romish church upon the Romish world, to stimulate their charities and their zeal. Such statements have been frequently put forth without any formal contradiction, because their notorious absurdity, amid an American community, neither required nor admitted one. This silence on our part has probably furthered the design for which they were made. They seem designed for effect upon Europe, to stimulate the hopes and enterprise of the Papists, and abuse Democracy in the eyes of its protestant friends, and at the same time to demonstrate it to its Catholic admirers, to be the 'evangelical element' of Romanism; while despotic and penurious Austria, on the other hand, is to be allured into the great North American mission, by the promise of the eventual subversion of popular liberty: Jesuitism it is, that is to put a hook into the nose of the great leviathan, now grown so fierce that none dare stir him up. Our silence meanwhile has undoubtedly been used to our disadvantage. Upon those for whom these statements were designed, the impression has been made, that the question at issue has gone against us by default.

As a summary refutation of statements like those above quoted, let

us invite the attention of our transatlantic brethren to a few statistics, which will show the value of M. De Tocqueville's statement for the purpose for which it is used. They will indicate, that even granting to be true what he says of the increase of the Catholic communion in this country, it will prove nothing of the religious tendencies of democracies. It would simply demonstrate that free institutions, civil and religious, a cheap and rich soil, and high wages, being presented on one side of the ocean, and starvation and civil and religious oppression driving nations into the sea on the other, there will naturally set a strong tide of migration from the latter to the former; and this of course will produce a 'surprising' increase of the communion to which this migration is attached. Such is the relation of the United States to some of the nations of the old world, and especially those of Catholic Europe; and hence the increase of that communion in this country, which has given colour to the sanguine predictions of its adherents. But the increase as little proves the tendency of democracies towards Romanism, as the present condition of Hindoostan does the tendencies of Brahminism towards the English Episcopacy, or the irruption of northern barbarians the tendencies of Roman civilization towards Vandalism.

The increase of Romanism in the United States is mainly the *increase of Catholic immigration*. A failure to notice this fact gives to the reports, which Catholic ecclesiastics are wont to make from this country, though true in words, all the mischiefs of a positive falsehood in their logical interpretation. But not only is the cause of increase unnoticed in their inferences from it, but the increase itself is exaggerated. That the Catholics constitute 'a majority of the population' of any of the western states, except perhaps the one originally planted by them, is a statement too much of the Bombastes vein, to require serious denial on this side of the Atlantic. Nor do they form a 'plurality' in any state other than the two founded by themselves. In most of the other states, they are far from being a 'powerful minority;' and it should be remembered, that protestantism, though divided on minor points, in relation to Romanism, should be reckoned as one body; in suspicion and aversion towards that system they are united. The 'Annales' quoted above estimate our Catholic population at 1,250,000. No other estimates, which we have seen, put it higher than 1,000,000; but granting it to amount to 1,200,000, their increase by birth and immigration during the last ten years has not exceeded 700,000. A few statistics will deprive this augmentation of much of its marvellousness. The council, held in Baltimore in 1830, estimated the population then within the Romish communion at 500,000. Statistics from the port of New York (see the American Almanac for 1838) show a foreign immigration at that port from 1830 to 1837 as follows:—

Years.	Numbers.
1830	30,224
1831	31,739
1832	48,589
1833	41,702
1834	48,110
1835	35,303
1836	60,541

The number of passengers who arrived at New York from Jan. 1st to July 27th, 1837, was 34,554.

We may therefore safely estimate the whole number for 1837 at 60,000

For the years 1838 and 1839 we have no returns.

Suppose them equal to the average of the two years preceding, and the one following, and we have for 1838, 60,000
1839, 60,000

According to a statement in the North American Review for Jan. 1841, from Jan. 1st to Nov. 1st, 1840, the immigration at New York amounted to 58,000; we may therefore put the total for the year 1840 at 60,000

According to these estimates the whole number of arrivals at the port of New York, from 1830 to 1841, amounts to 536,208

According to the statements of the Commercial Advertiser, reported in the American Almanac for 1838, the arrivals at the port of New York in 1836 were, to the whole number of arrivals in the sea-ports of the United States during the same year, nearly in the ratio of fifty-six to eighty. Applying this ratio of that year (and we have no means of arriving at that of any other) to the above estimate of arrivals in New York, and we have for the whole immigration on our seaboard from 1830 to 1840 inclusive, 766,011.

Reports from the port of Quebec, from 1830 to 1837, make the immigration at that port during those seven years, 216,437. At the annual average this estimate furnishes, applied to the four years subsequent, the total of immigration at Quebec from 1830 to 1841 would amount to 340,113. In all probability, especially in view of the enormous amount of public works executed in the United States during that period, more than two-thirds of this number have found their way into the United States, giving us an immigration, by way of Quebec, of 226,742, during the above period. Add this to the arrivals on our seaboard, and the total of arrivals in the United States from 1830 to 1841, amounts to 980,753.

The next question is, what proportion of these are Catholic immigrants? To answer this, we must inquire from what countries they come; and we regret that we have before us, to illustrate this

point, only the reports of a single year, though we know of no reason why this may not be taken as a sample of the rest. In 1836 the whole number of passengers arriving on our seaboard, were estimated at 80,952. Of these, from the British Isles were 47,792; from the German states, 20,142; from France, 4,443; making from these sources a total of 72,377. We may safely calculate that seven-eighths of these arrivals were immigrants, giving us an immigration from these countries of 64,448. Now, no one acquainted with the character of the immigrants from these sources, will doubt that at least five-sixths of these, amounting to 53,707, were French, German, and Irish Catholics. Now, supposing that seven-eighths of the 80,952 passengers who arrived that year were immigrants, the ratio of the Catholic to the entire immigration of the year was nearly that of fifty-three to seventy-one. Apply this ratio to the aggregate immigration on our seaboard from 1830 to 1841, and it gives, as the result for this period, 571,811. Of the immigration through the Canadas during this period, at least (as the Irish generally pass to the states, while the English remain in the province) five-sixths, we might say nine-tenths, amounting to 188,951, may be added to the above sum. This gives us the sum total of Catholic immigration from 1830 to 1841, 761,762. This estimate is unquestionably too small; we have purposely made it so, in order to avoid all cavils.

Now, according to the estimates of Catholics themselves, their increase during this period, allowing 50,000 to have been added during the last year, has not exceeded 800,000; and this estimate is thought to be too large by at least one hundred thousand; but at their own reckoning, against an augmentation of 800,000, there is an offset of above 760,000 immigrants, in addition to natural increase meanwhile. The latter we admit is not great; sickness and accident have dealt hardly with the poor emigrant; but amid a people that is doubling itself every thirty years, may not the natural increase fill up the deficit of 40,000?

In the light of these facts, does the progress of the Romish communion among us 'exceed all belief?' Is it even very 'surprising?' Does it indicate a mighty change in the course of public sentiment, or merely in the course of shipping? Does it show an increase of Romanism, taking Christendom at large? Could not a person speedily grow rich on this scheme of gain, by shifting coin from one pocket to another? Is there anything to warrant a tone of triumphing gratulation, even in the view of numerical increase, to say nothing of intellectual and moral value, in a country where nations are literally born in a day? But we should not compute numbers merely. A regard to the intellectual and moral worth of the increments, leaves still less reason for exultation. While Romanism has been receiving into her communion her ignorant and pauper masses in hundreds of thousands,

Protestantism has gathered around herself from the bosom of our nation, and warm from its heart with pilgrim blood, her millions. Could this article reach the ears of the foreign patrons of the Romish priesthood in this country, we would say to them, as knowing something of the West, the representations made to them of this part of our republic, if not in the letter, are at least in the intent and impression, glaringly false. The disgorgement upon our shores, within ten years past, of almost a million of foreigners,—a multitude which, though comprising many that we gladly welcome, consists, to a great extent, of the refuse of the prisons and poor-houses of the old world, and of the abject or turbulent outcasts of ghostly and secular despotisms,—furnishes the philosophy both of the growth of Romanism in this country, and of the recent alarm on that subject.

Among the extremely ignorant and credulous, the demi-savage of the frontier, or the frivolous rabbles of our great cities, priestly charlatanism and pretension may from time to time inveigle a convert. Music and painting, and costly decoration and pompous ceremonial, may allure the weak, the voluptuous, the libertine, and the sentimentalist; but into the true American heart little intoxication has been thrown. Upon the substantial and intelligent citizens of the United States, the fascination of outward and sensuous attractions is likely to produce but little impression. We are, in general, too much of a matter-of-fact people,—requiring to be convinced rather than delighted,—to be converted by mere appliances to the taste, by the lull of music, or charms of painting, or by the sublimity and richness of cathedrals; and we are too much inclined to have our own way, even in things sacred, to be cheated out of our liberty of thinking as we will, and speaking as we think, by suavity of manners, or splendour of costume, or consecrated titles, by the soft matin or solemn vesper, or the imprisoned sanctity of seraphic sisterhoods. Romanism may, from time to time, secure a convert; and so do the impostures of Mormon and Matthias: for no delusion, however absurd or blasphemous, can fail of some supporters amid a people where so much intellectual and social activity is at work, not only amid the enlightened masses, but ferments in wild freedom amid the dark-minded and the fanatical. But the case of an intelligent, native-born American, turning from protestantism to Romanism, is exceedingly rare. The truth is, Romanism is almost universally felt to be antagonist to the spirit of our institutions, and as such it is regarded with suspicion, and its thronging armies from abroad, with alarm.

If Romanism triumph in this country, it will be the triumph of fraud over generous confidence, of banded and drilled ignorance over schismatic intelligence, of cunning over strength, of the disciplined and mechanical armies of a ghostly despotism over the remiss or

factional forces of civil and religious freedom. Yet let not too much reliance be reposed on the factions of Protestantism, or the power of priestly demagoguism. Let an aggressive purpose against any great principle of our institutions be disclosed and avowed, and the very alarm will be a band of union.

But should Romanism conquer in ten thousand enterprises like the one now directed towards these United States, by the means now employed, it would prove nothing of the affinities of Democracy and religious despotism. It would prove the tendency of Democracy toward Romanism, just as much as it would its tendency to breed Germans and Irishmen, and no more. The facts, then, even if admitted as De Tocqueville states them, being found entirely irrelevant to his conclusions, his reasoning to account for those conclusions has no longer any significancy. Yet we will not leave it here. Let us consider a little the principles, to which he attempts to reduce his supposed facts, and by means of which he attempts to shore up his general conclusions. We read the human mind widely amiss in history and in our own breast, or his philosophy is as mistaken as his facts, in attempting to prove the necessary tendency of Democracy toward Romanism; his reasonings, succinctly stated, amount to the following propositions: 1st. 'Men cannot do without dogmatic belief,' especially in 'matters of religion,' (see book i. chap. v.,) and peculiarly indispensable is such belief in democratic communities. 2nd. The taste for unity, which the nature of their institutions produces, requires, that the source of dogmatic belief should be one. 'Religious powers not radiating from a common centre,' are naturally repugnant to their mind, (see book i. chap. vi.) 3rd. Therefore, to Rome, whose 'great unity attracts' them, the democratic ages will return. It will be seen that the connexion between the second and third of these steps implies an intermediate one, viz., that protestantism recognises and presents no one source of authority in matters of religious belief and discipline.

His views, as it regards the first proposition, are developed in chap. v.: 'Men,' he remarks, 'are immeasurably interested in acquiring fixed ideas of God and of the soul, and of their common duties to their fellow-men.'—'None but minds singularly free from the ordinary anxieties of life—minds at once penetrating, subtle, and trained to thinking—can, even with the assistance of much time and care, sound the depth of these most necessary truths. Studies of this nature are far above the average capacity of men; and even if the majority of mankind were capable of such pursuits, it is evident that leisure to cultivate them would still be wanting.'—'Fixed ideas of God and truth are indispensable to the daily practice of men's lives, but the practice of their lives prevents their acquiring such ideas.'

That these statements, rightly understood, convey an important truth, and one to be deeply pondered in our times, none will deny; but

couched as they are in general terms, they may be abused to conclusions the most false and mischievous.

What is meant by 'dogmatic belief'? Is it belief without reason—or simply belief without prior personal experience or investigation of the logical grounds on which all belief ultimately reposes? One would think, from M. De Tocqueville's reasoning about it, that it was like our coats, to be put off or put on at our pleasure, or a creature of popular suffrage, that could be ordained or deposed, like the gods of the Roman pantheon, by the greatest number of votes. But is not this form of belief as involuntary as any other, the nature of the evidence that compels it being the only difference? Is not what we term 'dogmatic belief' always based on a confidence in the *character* of the dogmatizer—on presumption of his sagacity, knowledge, truthfulness, and benevolence, or on evidence of celestial commission and guidance? Is it not obvious, that trust in the mere dicta of others is not at our own option, and cannot subsist except in view of some qualities entitling them to credence? The question, then, whether the democratic ages will seek their source of dogmatic belief in the Church of Rome, must be determined by the inquiry, whether they will find in that church grounds warranting such confidence, and not whether they would gladly find some one authority on which to repose. Unity alone, even did it subsist in it, to the extent which its advocates claim, would not, of itself, be sufficient to attract belief; for men cannot forget, that unity can warrant trust only so far as it is the result of intellectual freedom. The united testimony of millions on the rack will not secure it. As long as men repeat only what they are taught and compelled to utter, on pain of imprisonment and torture, the conspiring voices of a thousand generations can only carry with it the authority of the first utterer.

Mankind remember, with a vividness but too painful, what Romish unity has cost—the smothering of the human mind through dark and doleful centuries, and the consequent stagnation of human society through those long cycles of sin and shame—how many battle-fields it has crimsoned—how many dungeons reared—how many a genius, heaven-inspired, it has stifled—how many a pure and noble heart it has broken—how many of the gentle, the brave, the gifted, the lovely, and the pious, it has dismissed from the dungeon, the wheel, and the stake, to heaven. The world will be slow to forget, that it is the pale and sickly child of fear; and the unity of despotism will have as little charm for democratic ages in the spiritual, as in the political world.

But after all, what is the vaunted unity of Romanism? Amid the dogmas of councils that contradict each other—the opposing decisions and contradictory legislation and mutual anathemas of popes—the conflicting assumptions of antagonist sacred colleges—where shall we seek it? How arrest the tenuous and changeful phantom? Amid

clashing infallibilities, which shall be *the* infallible? The 'voice of the universal church,' what is it, too often, other than the rescript of the last dominant faction, stamped with guilty frequency in blood? The strongest hand it has too often been, however polluted and crimson, that has clutched the keys of St. Peter. What then is the unity of Rome save the unity of organism merely—the unity of body with diversity of souls—the identity of a corpse, tenanted in succession by many vampires?

But if, fleeing the dreadful responsibility of her many inconsistencies, absurdities, and crimes, for which, in their time, the Romish church arrogated the direct inspiration and warrant of heaven, she now endeavours to take refuge in the plea of unity and infallibility in 'matters of faith alone,' who shall draw the line where faith ends, and vision begins? Who shall divide the realm of implicit belief, from that where logic ceases to be blasphemy, and thought is no longer revolt against heaven? Who shall erect the awful barrier, over which the 'limitary cherub' shall stand sentinel, and the glittering sword of God brandish its fiery circles, warning profane reason afar? Who but the infallible church itself?—thus presenting again the spectacle of an infallible spiritual despotism, the arbiter of its own limits. Might we not expect this claim granted again, to see that ambitious despotism gradually extending its domain, under the pretence of relevancy to things spiritual, until all secular interests should be overshadowed by its supremacy, as time is overshadowed by eternity, and the visible is overhung by the invisible world?

What, then, are the grounds upon which she will challenge the trust and obedience of coming ages? Will they be allured to her doctrine and discipline, by the fact, that born in the twilight of an eclipsing faith, like the earth-born monsters of fable, they attained their portentous growth in profound night? Will they find reason for implicit adhesion to a theology that to a great degree grew up apart from the Bible—nurtured and matured amid ecclesiastics, and hierarchs, and councils, not unfrequently too ignorant to read the word of God, or with just learning enough to distort, or wit to sneer at it—men subtle to torture isolated passages into puerile or wicked sophisms, and to wrest history into allegory, and plain fact into mystery, in support of some blasphemous usurpation—with imagination to extract from the mission of the Galilean fishermen, and the 'gospel of the poor,' the meretricious pomp, and gorgeous ritual, and impious pretension of the Innocents and Gregories; or with a frivolous and cold-hearted scepticism, that trafficked in the superstitions it fostered, and made mockery alike of the faith on its lying lips, and the abused credulity of the human race? Will they give in an unquestioning submission to a discipline, which, taking root in a brain-sick philosophy, fostered by popular ignorance and priestly ambition, ripened to deadly

fruitage under the dog-days of spiritual despotism,—an Upas, whose leaves drank the poisonous dew of the long night of modern history, and whose branches still moan with airs borne from that dungeon-era of the human mind—from the penitential cell, the pallid vigil, the dim confessional, the midnight oratory, and the profound glooms of the sacred office—from sunless chambers, whose fearful secrets were whispered only in the ear of God, and of human remorse, cruelty, and despair—the sighs of cloistered passion, unslaked desires, repented or broken vows, impenitent regrets, and nature trampled and stifled, but panting still, immortal; a tree, around whose trunk blanch the bones of a glorious army of martyrs, and of unnumbered suicides of the hair shirt, the iron girdle, and the scourge. Will Christendom be persuaded to regard *that* as the tree of life? Will it, without interrogatory, receive to its faith and obedience that system of theology and of discipline? Will it seek for light and order there—or will the fruit of that faith and discipline atone for the untold agonies and sins of their growth? Did Rome use her ascendancy, reached by a path so tortuous and foul, so wisely and so well, that Christendom will be charmed by the memory, to commit to her again the keys of dogmatic belief? If with its spirit subdued by ages of spiritual oppression, it at length could no longer tolerate her, will it, in its democratic era, with the wild passion of liberty in its heart, be fascinated to submit to her, a second time, its liberty to speak and to think?

Nor can the Romish church shake herself from the past, and say those were the sins of her youth and her ignorance. She never *was* ignorant, never was young. She has always stood in the full blaze of Divine illumination. Born, like Minerva in the fable, immediately of celestial power and wisdom, she had, from the outset, her full panoply—the mature perfection of her source. Other systems may change—to them there is a place for repentance—but she is not a man that she should change, nor the son of man that she should repent. The vicar of heaven, she partakes of its immutability! Such are her pretensions. They debar her from any plea of infancy or inexperience, or any promise of amendment. She cannot deny, nor denounce, nor lament the past. In an evil hour she clad herself with the mail of infallibility. As with the armour of the knights of the middle ages, its wearer once down cannot rise under it, nor evade the strokes aimed at her. The harness of her strength has become a stifling compress, forbidding all growth or change. She must, then, in every age, be held to a strict reckoning for all her past falsehoods and cruelties. Nor can she identify herself with Christianity, and charge upon that blessed mission of love, her impurities and her crimes. Vain is her attempt to foist herself upon mankind as *the church*, and to grapple her putrid system to the eternal pillars of the temple of God. The original charter of our religion, witnessed by the signature of heaven,

and which the nations hold in their hand, refute the libel, and for ever forbid the union. Vain is all her array of saintly names,—her Anselms, her Augustines, her Las Cases, her Fenelons, her Cyrans, and her Pascals, in proof of her assumptions. We bless God for them, that in the darkest eras he leaves himself not without witness, that, under the most mischievous systems, there are men whose hearts are purer than their heads, and whose devotion is stronger than their philosophy or theology. But they are no more the products of her faith and discipline, than was Socrates the offspring of Athenian polytheism. Romanism is no more Christianity, than was ‘Caliban a God;’ and now that the fumes of their long intoxication, from her drugged cup, are passing from the brain of the nations, it will be hard to brutify them again with the delusion. Alas! Christianity slept—and the night-hag pressed on her perturbed slumbers, and abused with wicked dreams her long repose.

What title then will she show, that will constrain ‘dogmatic belief?’ Will she point to her history, whose dark hues make the crimson annals of the secular Cæsars seem white? Will she hold out her sceptre, still wearing the bloody finger-prints of her Alexanders and Borgias? Will she direct to her stream of ecclesiastical authority, that has puddled through ages of fraud, incest, and massacre? Will she lead the nations to this, as the river of life, of which they are to drink and become immortal? Will she point to her purple, still dripping with Albigenian massacre, and the carnage of St. Bartholomew, as the white mantle, descended to her from the meek and lowly Jesus? Will not mankind see on it forms more hideous than the demoniac emblazonry of her Auto-da-fé? Will she point to her unity, built up of the suffocating fears of those that dared not think, and the strong despair of those that dared—that mighty cloister of the human soul, whose top shut out the light of heaven, and whose foundations were in sepulchral gloom—which towered amid the silence of a field of graves, and through whose rusted gratings and thick air, the winds of heaven breathed but a wailing and stifling monotony—its tranquillity the stillness of fear, its order the regularity of despotism? Will she vindicate her title to the love of the democratic ages, by directing them to her long war against free thought and liberal philosophy, and her continued denunciations against the ‘pestilent liberty of speech and the press?’ Or, finally, will she attempt to cover the past, and to come forth to the nations in the guise of an angel of light? This she will attempt; but in an age of free and fearless inquiry, can she accomplish it? Can she bribe or awe history to perpetual dumbness? Or will she bewitch the human reason with her sorceries, or charm the memory of the world to forgetfulness? Will she dazzle with the splendour of her ceremonial the eye that would look narrowly at her? Or shall the grandeur of her cathedrals cover the multitude of her

slain? Will the nations, sobered from a long delirium-tremens, be fascinated to drink again of that cup, which they have found to be brimming with the 'wine of the wrath of Almighty God?' All this must be done, before the democratic ages will see in her that title to confidence which must ever form the basis of dogmatic belief, and 'return to the bosom of Rome!'

But it is not true, that Protestants recognise no one source of authority in matters of religious belief. They do recognise such an one, and one that is 'single and uniform.' It has the singleness of God, the uniformity of inspiration. It is the Bible. Therefore, the want of such unity of authority need not drive them to Romanism. True, they acknowledge no church or hierarchy as the infallible hierophants of heaven; they claim to have no inspired expositors of the word of God; and there may, consequently, be a diversity of exposition. But may there not, also, be a diversity of exposition of the canons and decrees of the councils and the Vatican? And if, to remedy this, new canons and decisions are issued, will they not, as long as human language and intellect are imperfect, and human nature perverse, be liable to misrepresentation? So that rescript upon rescript, and bull explanatory of bull, canon declaratory of canon, would be requisite to infinity. Will the words which man's wisdom teacheth, be less obscure and bungling than those of the Holy Ghost?

In arguing the necessity of 'dogmatic belief,' to free nations, our author remarks, (chap. vi.) 'I am inclined to think, that if faith be wanting in man, he must serve; and if he be free, he must believe.' Noble sentiment! and worthy to be written on marble. But 'he must believe' what? The dogmas of the councils of Nice, Chalcedon, Ferrara, and Trent? The imperial edicts of the Vatican? Of the Gregories, the Clements, the Urbans, the Alexanders, and Leos? The decretals of Isidore, the fatalism of Augustine, the legends of the saints, the worship of the mother of God? Purgatory—the real presence—the distinction between *homousia* and *homoiousia*; and between 'sufficient' and 'efficacious grace,' or the Divine legitimacy of the successors of St. Peter? Must he believe *these*, or serve? Must he receive *these*, on pain of temporal as well as eternal perdition, or rather the great verities of a just and present God, a crucified and risen Atoner and Saviour, a regenerating and sanctifying Spirit, man's fallen estate and way of recovery, a future retribution 'according to deeds done in the body,' the universal law of meekness, mercy, justice, purity, and love, giving the sanctions of celestial command to the dictates of the natural conscience, and arraigning its violators at the tribunal of eternal doom? Which of the two classes of dogmas are those, without the belief of which freedom cannot live? And is a heaven-inspired interpreter required to decipher *these* from the Bible?

If, in expressing his belief of the incompatibility of complete

religious 'independence' with entire public freedom, our author means, by religious independence, the denial of any principle of authority in religion, the sentiment is truly philosophic and profound; and no Protestant will dissent from him: it is his adhesion to such a principle of authority—the Bible—that constitutes him a Protestant. But if he means that the rejection of all interlocutory authorities between the human mind and the revealed word of God, or any authority adding to, or overruling that word, not exhibiting, in its warrant, the same sign manual of heaven, is incompatible with entire public freedom, we would ask, upon what chapter in human history, or on what laws of the human mind, this opinion is based? Are not the liberties of Europe, at this hour, attributable manifestly to the assertion of such independence, in the Lutheran reformation? Has not protestantism almost invariably been the handmaid of civil freedom, while scarlet-clad Rome has almost uniformly been throned on the 'beast' of secular tyranny?

There is a natural affinity between religious and civil despotism. This, Rome appears, in all her history, instinctively to have discerned, and has manifested a uniform affection for her secular sister. If she has ever quarrelled with her, it has been with reluctance—not because she loved her the less, but self more. The exceptive cases are few, and those rather apparent than real. They were the result of circumstances, that threw her for a time into an unnatural alliance, which she took the first opportunity to escape from and betray. When she has been found on the side of resistance to tyranny, it has been, not because she hated human liberty the less, but because that tyranny was hostile to herself, and displaced her own—because her self-love was stronger than her natural affection; and I doubt not, should the despotisms of modern Europe become opposed to her, she will, against those despotisms, clamour most stoutly for the rights of man, while the voice that should be raised in their behalf, under the shadows of her own supremacy, would speedily be stifled in depths, read only by the eye of God. And should the public sentiment of the globe tend, with overmastering force, toward civil liberty, her love of life might lead her to give the lie to all her past history, and attempt to palm herself upon mankind, as the friend of popular freedom. But there is a vital bond connecting her with secular despotism, which she cannot sunder—their life-blood beats from the same heart. History and philosophy both show this. The same principles underlie civil and religious liberty. These two species of freedom shade into each other, like the colours of the spectrum.

It has been resistance to spiritual tyranny, that has taught men to question that of the State; it has been resistance to secular power, attempting to coerce religious belief and practice, that has led to the investigation of the foundations and limits of all human governments.

The direct allegiance of the human soul to a higher than all human power, being once recognised, the doctrines of the divine right of kings and of the duty of implicit obedience in the governed, is exploded for ever. Thus, protestantism and civil liberty have ministered to each other in all modern history. Thus, hand in hand, have they come down through ages of proscription and blood; with shield to shield have they stood in the battle-fields of England, Scotland, Holland, and Germany—over the ocean they were wafted by the same wing—side by side have they grown beneath the pine and the holly in the solitudes of the New World. All that is best of American civilization is the joint offspring of both. Take the map of Europe, also, and mark off the countries which have made the nearest approaches to entire public freedom, and you will have limited the domain of protestantism. The exceptions are only those countries which, under the banner of protestantism, have erected new papacies. For whatever temporal power, be it king, or sacred bench, or consistory, or synod, comes between the human mind and the Bible, matters little—it is papacy still. Note those districts where political as well as intellectual life beats most feebly, and your eye will rest upon lands where protestantism was early suffocated in her own blood, and civil and intellectual liberty perished with her.

Now, such having been the alliance which civil and religious liberty have instinctively and invariably formed, during the ages of their imperfect development, what facts of history, or laws of mind, warrant the prediction, that, as they approach the period of their mature growth, they will begin to shrink from each other in fear, and that men, 'frightened at the prospect of their unbounded independence,' will voluntarily surrender the one or the other? Especially, are we to believe that men who would not, for their life's blood, sacrifice the tithe of a hair of their political freedom, will deliberately and spontaneously commit the arbitrament of the unspeakable interests of their spiritual being, and their liberty to think and to speak with reference to these interests, to a ghostly despotism, whose hands still drip with the gore of their fathers, and whose attributes of awe and majesty the very philosophic method born of their civil institutions teaches them to despise? Will not he who has ceased to be awe-struck at sceptres, soon trample on the crosier also? History and philosophy alike preclude the opinion, that one domain of thought should continue free and full of light, joined on to another, dark and clanking with chains—and much more, that the soul, in one department perpetually disciplined to self-reliance, and to bear no restraints, except those imposed by its own reason, should in the other, where immortal consequences impend, and the mightiest motives press on it with the claims of personal duty, and stimulate its anxious search after truth, voluntarily submit itself to a despotism over its reason, and an espionage upon its

thought, and in order to escape from the painfulness of doubt, and the labour of inquiry, should take refuge beneath a tyranny whose shadow has been to human society like that of the angel of death.

To attempt to combine the salvation of liberty in one department of the human mind, with its loss in another, is to attempt an outrage on nature—to join the body of life to the body of death; and we hazard the prediction, that those countries which possess religious liberty apart from political, or political apart from religious, will ere long lose the one, or gain the other; and that governments which think to reconcile their subjects to the loss of political liberty, by fostering among them education, and freedom of intellectual and moral inquiry, are undermining themselves, and nursing under their foundations the earthquake at which the cities of the nations shall fall. They cannot teach mankind to question all else, and leave their own authority unarraigned. They cannot make their subjects free and bold philosophers, and keep them permanently timid and slavish politicians. The human mind can be free nowhere, and enslaved anywhere—it can rest nowhere between absolute slavery and entire freedom. Till the universal human mind reaches one of these points, agitation and revolution will be the course of human affairs.

Most vain then is the anticipation, that democratic ages will drift toward the Romish despotism. Her assumptions most assuredly will not remain unquestioned, or be submitted to without challenge, in a type of society most impatient of mere authority in every thing else; which regards no human opinions as sacred, and looks upon the most grey antiquity without awe; which being itself created from the ruin of older forms and fixtures, boldly pierces through show and dress, and rates things at their intrinsic and essential value.

The belief of M. De Tocqueville, therefore, relative to the tendency of democratic ages towards the papacy, seems to us as little sustained by his philosophy as his facts. We can perceive nothing in the intellectual habits and tastes of such ages, that warrant such a conclusion, or that does not forbid it. The alternative will be not between Romanism and infidelity, but infidelity and protestantism. The distractions of protestantism may disgust and drive to infidelity—not, I think, to the 'bosom of Rome.' But protestantism in its essential nature is no offence to the democratic taste for 'impartiality,' 'simplicity, and unity' in the governing power—it is in perfect and beautiful accord with it. It is only when it proves false to itself, and becomes a spurious Romanism, that it exhibits the spectacle of 'religious powers radiating from different centres.' Its schisms are, to a great extent, the offspring of spiritual tyranny attempted or resisted—the effects of the spirit of the papacy lingering in protestantism—the paroxysms with which the demon rends the body he is loth to leave. They are the product, not so much of the right

XIM



of private opinion allowed, as withheld. We acknowledge we have no partiality for this form of the papacy. It offends by its inconsistency, disgusts by its pretension, and provokes contempt by its imbecility; while its tendency to annihilate the authority of religion itself awakens the most solemn alarm. But it still has the merit, that it asserts in word the eternal principles of religious liberty, though it constantly and glaringly violates them—that its theory is better than its practice, and may in time amend it; whereas Romanism is, by her essential principles, necessarily and unchangeably bound to her present policy.

Nor do the divisions of protestantism deserve to be entitled ‘several religions.’ Nor is this their impression. Such language is strange to us. They all hold of the same great charter, and deny all religious powers emanating from any other centre. They recognise, in general, the same fundamental truths. They are associations for a special purpose, whose powers are limited to the purpose for which they combine, and to the numbers that voluntarily enrol themselves in them. It seems impossible for a Frenchman to comprehend the American idea of a church. He seems ever to have before his eyes, as answering to this term, some great central power, with authority commensurate with that of the state, and within these limits grasping the keys, if not wielding the sword, and claiming exclusive spiritual jurisdiction.

Now, if there are sects among protestants putting forth such pretensions, arrogating to be *the* church exclusively, or not conceding to others the same right, moral as well as political, of ecclesiastical association as they claim for themselves—assuming to overshadow our empire with their authority, while other organizations are but instances of intrusion, usurpation, or revolt; or if, by means of a national centralization, and by subordinate grades of administration and jurisdiction, they are seen causing their edicts for the adoption or amendment of rituals and symbols, and ecclesiastical order, and their commands to believe or disbelieve, to profess or abjure, receive or excommunicate, to be urged with oppressive and riving force through every little band of disciples in the land; converting the peaceful hamlet into the theologic arena, the simple-hearted believer into the cunning and zealous partisan, diverting his energies from the work of sanctification and conversion to jangling and proselytism; breaking up the little flock, gathered with much toil and grief in the wilderness, that in their weakness and desolation had been drawn together by a sense of a common feebleness, and love of a common Saviour; and exhibiting to the sneering infidelity and libertinism of her cities, the scandal of mutual suspicion, calumny, and denunciation, amid the professed followers of a religion of peace and love;—I say, if there are sects, in whole or in part, answering to this description, they will present the spectacle of two or more suns claiming to rule the same

hemisphere—of religious powers radiating from different centres—of empire overlapping empire—the lines of conflicting sovereignty crossing and recrossing in all directions—tyranny jostling tyranny—assumption clashing against assumption. They will offend democratic ideas of both spiritual and organic unity; and to the extent that any large and powerful ecclesiastical organization, calling itself Catholic or Protestant, may exhibit such a taste for despotism, our countrymen must be pardoned if they watch its ambitious temper with jealousy. A centralization, a unity in the hands of such a power, might be calamitous to liberty. But let these vast and ponderous organisms disappear—let them cease to grate on the ear of the nation their jostling clangour, let their chain-work of subordinated judicatories and administrations cease to rattle and clash over the heads of the people—let the church centralise in love on earth, but in authority in heaven, and the taste of democracy for unity need not be offended, nor its jealousy be aroused, by associations for religious purposes, more than by those for literary, educational, and commercial ends. There is an essential and eternal unity in truth, reason, and God. These are the recognised centralising authorities of democracies; all others they regard as illegitimate and tyrannous.

Let us not be understood as wishing to palliate the guilt or absurdity of the present position of protestant sects in this country. The evils are many and dreadful. The waste of men, of money and of mind—the tendency to disorganise society and to generate intellectual and moral sordidness, to narrow and degrade education, we would not attempt to extenuate; and especially, the fearful sacrifice of piety, and moral power, and of the souls of men. But we deny these to be the legitimate results of genuine protestantism—they are the offspring of a bastard papacy. It is believed, as we have said above, that the schisms of protestantism are chiefly the exponents of attempted usurpation upon religious liberty—the forms on which such attempts are prosecuted, or in which they are resisted. To the same cause, we believe, is attributable those movements of religious, combined with social anarchism, that our times are witnessing in the East and West—in the East, openly warring upon the institutions of the Sabbath and the Church, on civil law and domestic order, and ultimately on marriage, property, and society itself—and in the West, urged on by a rude, clamorous and Cyclopean force, manifesting itself more or less in all of the various religious organisms, and at work in the darkness and the depths of society, full of vehement sincerity and blind passion, ignorant to build up, mighty to destroy—clamouring for union, yet pervaded with the intensest venom of schism—wordy for charity, yet the very impersonation of hate—vapouring of liberty, without intelligence to discern, or liberality to grant, the freedom wherewith Christ has made free—arrogating to be governed by the Spirit, yet enslaved

and enslaving to the most narrow literalism, and the most lifeless formalism—deriving its strength from appeals to low prejudice and petty ambition, vulgar envy, to the love of novelty, and an impatience of established order, often amounting to an insurrection against all religious restraint. Such forms of fanatic anarchism, like those of anabaptism in Germany, and fifth-monarchy men in England, are the natural result of usurpation upon human liberty, attempted in violation of acknowledged principles. There will not be wanting those that will perceive the inconsistency and resent the wrong, and who, without the capacity or the candour to make true discriminations, will declare war against all existing religious institutions. Others again, under the plea of violated rights, will be eager to wreak their revenge upon all religious and social restraints. Thus those who are restive under any settled order—who are galled by the bonds of all moral obligation, and who regard religious truth as an intrusive alarmist upon their pleasures—the agitator and the epicure—the sceptic and the demagogue—the driveller of a puling theophilanthropy and a sensual sentimentalism—the witling of a flippant blasphemy—the desperado of a philosophy shallow and putrid, or dashing with waves upheaved from the bottomless darkness, against all order human and divine,—these will combine with the ignorant bigot and sincere enthusiast, and the aspirant to the glory of a religious reformer in the alleged vindication of human liberty.

Such, however, is the homage our nature compels to truth, that it is impossible to gather a party, unless around some semblance of it. The most atrocious conspiracies against human society have had some truth as a nucleus. They take their stand upon some real wrong, or some great principle really violated. We must ever beware of furnishing to the elements of mischief in society any such germ of crystallization. If we do, we may be sure they will not be slow to perceive it, and their common affinities will gather them around it. For though some truth is required as a principle of life, it needs marvellously little to leaven an immense mass of dead falsehood with the most acid fermentation. It requires but a single spark to explode the mighty mass of combustible matter, that gathers with time under the most stable structure of man. It is one of the mischiefs of all despotism, that it drives reform into the arms of revolution; it is the curse of spiritual tyranny, that it forces spiritual reform into this evil alliance. The companionship in which reform is found again reacts upon itself, and tends to divide society between anarchical ultraism and bigoted conservatism.

Most disastrous for mankind are those periods, when liberty becomes identified with anarchism, and order with the defence of old abuses. Such an alliance is most mischievous to both. It drives from the ranks of reform those very spirits most needed to enlighten, attempt,

and guide its movements—minds of clear vision, and cool temperament, and pure taste, blending with a strong love of liberty an inextinguishable thirst for order. These it disgusts or alarms. Between liberty on the one hand, and order on the other—between abuses which they hate, and excesses which they abhor, they withdraw into neutrality, or their intense abhorrence of anarchy drives them into the arms of the opposers of all reform. Again, such a connexion is most disastrous to order, as it leads it to throw its shield around abuses constantly provoking attack and incapable of defence, and to grapple itself to falsehoods which, being intrinsically rotten, must fall, and are likely, in their fall, to drag down in ruin all that attaches to them. Thus reform, without curb or guide, is left to run its blind and passionate course of disastrous defeat or more disastrous triumph, and order married to despotism lives to corrupt and oppress, or with the tyranny she has espoused is laid on the block of revolution. Thus, in the sixteenth century, it was the excesses perpetrated in the name of religious liberty—springing in part from the fact that the Reformation was not true to its own principles—that drove out or kept aloof from that great movement the minds that should have tempered it. This was the cause which finally stopped it in the middle of its course, and left European society to reach, through ages of agony and shame, the prize that then seemed within full grasp. The violence of the German chiefs, and of the fanatics of Munster, neutralised the timid but gifted Melancthon, silenced the sarcasm and learning of Erasmus, and enlisted them at last in behalf of Romish absurdities. It was the atrocities of French Jacobinism, that threw the mighty intellect of Burke, with its natural sympathies with freedom, into the lists of toryism—made Southey a lauder of the divine right, and the democratic dramatist of Tuscany, the lofty Alfieri, stoop to courtly sycophancy. We may add, this country at this time exhibits the spectacle of a small party rallying around great and eternal principles, that in other times would have bid legions of swords leap from their scabbards, and would have filled millions of hearts with enthusiasm, and millions of voices with eloquence and prayer; but by its extravagances, and by the acrimony into which it was provoked by wanton attacks in its early history, driving away from it hundreds of thousands who most warmly embrace its first principles, but who, because they cannot fellowship the temper and measures, and the extravagant theories, in company with which these principles are found, shrink away from a contest where they can wish to neither party a victory. Thus the moderate and cool-headed class, whose gentleness and clear-sightedness are especially in requisition, withdraw, and leave the fanaticism of conservatism and the fanaticism of reform to battle for a field which they should have claimed as their own.

Order in this world of ours lives only by reform. Ruinous for any

human institute is it to think to remain stationary while the great globe is turning. Society shrinks back with horror from the abyss into which the anarchists would plunge her, but the rocks, meanwhile, on which she fixes her obstinate step, are shaking with a mighty Niagara, whose undermining fury is foaming beneath. But American society and the American church cannot long abide on such a foothold. They can stand nowhere but upon the everlasting basis of truth and right. Whatever in the constitution, discipline, creeds, and usages of religious organizations, will not bear the closest scrutiny—whatever in their spirit or practice will not defy the most malignant interpretation, they may be sure will be seized hold of by a party, whose vulture scent of moral carrion is stimulated to unnatural keenness by their impatience of religious restraint and hatred of all excellence higher than their own. We may be sure that every restraint not clearly warranted by the great original charter of our faith, will cause to explode from out of established systems some reformer, with perhaps more zeal than knowledge, who for one defective feature will think he does God service in laying the whole structure in ruins. Let such a reformer come forth—smarting under a sense of wrongs, real or imaginary—strong in a conscious jealousy for God and human liberty—with a mind powerful but narrow, vehement but erratic, exhibiting the not unusual combination of a rancorous zeal, and deep sincerity, with low cunning and popular artifice—let him blow the alarm trumpet, and beat the *réveille*, and the ‘vasty deeps’ of popular delusion and passion will be moved, and will pour forth their armies, multitudinous, and of every hue. Malcontents of all orders, who have points of common sympathy in the worst or best parts of human nature—the weak and the wicked—the enthusiast and the hypocrite—the pious duper and the pious dupes—the open-throated atheist and the sanctimonious charlatan—the political intriguer and the religious aspirant—in short, all who, for any cause, hate or fear established order, will rally to the call. All these will rally around the religious anarchy; and whatever abuses, inconsistencies, and scandals may attach to religious bodies, they will seize hold of, and knot them into a scourge of scorpions to lash the offending organisms. Thus bringing their impeachment, they will throw down the gage of battle, and call in the million to the arbitrament. Failing of all else, they may at last invoke the powers of ruin that heave restlessly beneath all established systems, and they will come,

Kορτος τε, Βριαρειως τε, Γυγης τ' αυτος πολεμοιο.

They will come, and the triumph of reform will be the restoration of chaos.

This religious anarchy, papacy is anticipating with wishful eyes; she urges it on; she stimulates the prejudices and passions that are to work it out, with the design, when it occurs, to spread out to the

weary and bewildered millions her bosom, with its delusive show of peace, and to allure them to abandon both their liberty and their license, their weariness of doubt and of thought, their spiritual life and its spasmodic agonies, together in her embrace. It is no new thing for the Church of Rome, when it suits her purpose, to play the demagogue, and agitate in the name of civil and religious liberty. While she claims to herself the changelessness of marble, to her agents she grants a wonderful elasticity of principle and of conscience. Not unfrequently she has been seen in history, in one country framing conspiracies, plotting rebellion, and weaving dark and tortuous intrigue, nominally in defence of liberty of conscience, while in another she was imprisoning and burning those suspected of its exercise. In one clime, her Jesuits, in the assertion of the most unbounded civil and religious liberty, leave a Roger Williams and a Jefferson far behind them; while in others, they invoke the dagger of the assassin and the sword of the magistrate against the champions and confessors of these 'pestilent' doctrines. Against Henry IV. of France and Elizabeth of England, they preached up doctrines bordering on Jacobinism, constantly inculcating on their subjects the right of deposing and killing kings; while, amid those of Philip II. of Spain, they were teaching the human mind to crouch in the dust before the heaven-descended majesty of tyrants. Again, under the reign of the Stuarts, her agents stood forth as the champions of universal toleration, stimulating resistance to the Established Church even to treason; while in France, they were abusing the weak superstition and iron power of the Bourbons to pursue the Huguenots with imprisonment, confiscation, and exile. Thus, in our times, while along the Danube Rome is teaching implicit obedience to despotism under penalty of eternal damnation, in the wilds of Connaught she is instigating passions, blind and mad with oppression and fanaticism, to banded assassination in resistance to 'the powers that be.' On the shores of the Levant she persecutes for change of religious sentiment; in the Pacific she forces on the government of a feeble island universal toleration, not only of native believers, but also of foreign missionaries, considered by that government as corruptors both of its polity and morality. Along the Tagus and the Po, she withholds the Bible, and sedulously darkens the human mind; while her zeal for human enlightenment leads her to strew with her schools and universities the borders of the Mississippi. She overlooks the corrupt Italian, the dark-minded Austrian, and the bigoted Spaniard, but her sympathies glow with strange intensity for the 'scum of protestant sects' along the shores of the Hudson, the Chesapeake, the Ohio and Illinois. Her prelates keep the conscience of Metternich at Vienna, or harangue the populace, in a political canvass, at New York. Professing to be as impeccable as the Holy Ghost, and as immutable as the decalogue, her pliancy and suppleness

are most admirable, presenting in the outer courts of her temple forms elastic and changeful as vapour, while in the gloomy recess of her shrine, stands her own iron statue, rusting in the blood of fifty generations.

Now, as in Ireland she conspires and assassinates for religious equality, and in England clamours most loudly among dissenters against the union of church and state, we predict in this country she will be found, although with her canons full of denunciations of temporal and eternal penalties against heresy, yet in ostensible alliance with religious and social Jacobins in the professed vindication of spiritual liberty against ecclesiastical intolerance. She will attempt to foist herself upon the populace as the champion of those wronged or oppressed by protestant sects, in hopes that she will, at least, be received as protector and mistress. In this hope, we think, she will be disappointed. But she may do our institutions and our moral sentiment, meanwhile, terrible mischief; she may loosen the bands of religion on the public mind—may dazzle and delude the weak and ignorant, and perplex the faith of multitudes, and may swell fearfully the hosts of unbelief: a republic, tottering on the brink of infidelity, she may, perhaps, have power to impel down the abyss; but convert the turbulent, free-thinking American democracy, into a devout, superstitious, and submissive flock of the vast fold of Rome, she never will. However adroitly she may intrigue, and shift, and falter between parties in equipoise, she can never thereby change the great laws of the human mind, or neutralise permanent moral causes.

So far are we from believing that the democratic ages will return to the bosom of Rome, that we think Romanism cannot live in those ages. She can live in them only by that freedom and tolerance of religious opinions that must forbid her spread, and ultimately prove fatal to her. Her whole policy and legislation show that she has an instinctive dread of such freedom and tolerance, a presentiment that she is to die by them. If she lives by them, she lives on poison. The spectre of a night of centuries, like other phantoms of night, she will fade into air as the day-dawn of truth brightens into morning. Indeed, paradoxical as may seem the assertion, with all her boasted growth in this country, she is at this moment dying among us. A name may spread, while the reality is perishing. The term Roman Catholic, for aught we know, may survive these thousand years; but the thing, we believe, will have died long before. But we are not now writing of mere terms. A church assuming to be an inspired interpreter of Heaven—an authorised interlocutor between God and the Bible and the human mind—claiming the right, though it may for a while veil it under expediency, to coerce belief by force, and to punish heresy by spiritual and temporal penalties—arrogating to itself an allegiance paramount to that of the state, and to hold in its hand the sceptre of pardon, the keys of

heaven, and the chains of hell—such a church and the freedom of human reason and speech can no more co-exist, than two bodies can fill the same space at the same time ; the one negatives the existence of the other. Such a church we mean by that of Rome. Such she is, and such must ever be ; to strip her of these attributes is to slay her.

Now, the temper and institutions of democracies tend directly to produce in the mind a denial of such prerogatives ; but he that denies these claims of the Romish Church, ceases, by that very act, to be a Romanist. This is the very result that our institutions are working in the Catholic masses brought to our shores. On their landing, they are baptized into a spirit directly the antithesis of Romanism. As they become fused with our population, they cannot fail to be affected with the intellectual and moral sympathies that unfold them like an atmosphere. Foreign priesthood and colleges can no more shut them out from these influences, than they can from the heat and cold of our climate. Conversion by this process, unnoted and unmarked by change of name, is constantly going on. The strict genuine Romanists among us would be found feeble, both in numbers and character, and those few rarely dare declare themselves. Multitudes in this country are Romanists only in name. From the most absurd and pernicious, yet most essential dogmas of that sect, they have long since cut loose. They have become Americans—they have become freemen, civilly and spiritually ; they have learned to resist priestly dictation in secular matters ; they yield to it little more than a nominal submission in spiritual. They acknowledge no temporal allegiance to Rome, and their ecclesiastical allegiance sits loosely on them. They assert and exercise liberty of reason and of faith. Should issue ever be joined between Romanism and Americanism—between their civil and ecclesiastical allegiance—we should find them rallying, amid the foremost and warmest-hearted, around our institutions. This class of men we respect and honour ; we do not wish to forget, that in times that have tried men they have been true—that they have been prodigal of their wealth and their blood for American institutions—that among those who perilled their 'lives and fortunes and their sacred honour,' in the assertion of the imprescriptible rights of a human being, stands the hallowed name of Carrol. We are aware, too, that in a recent political canvass, in New York, many have rejected indignantly the dictation of a Romish prelate, and nobly cast their suffrages for the political equality of all sects. We are sorry to be obliged, in speaking of an ecclesiastical system, to use a descriptive title that seems to embrace such men. It is to be regretted that a name, most justly odious, is retained when the reality has been repudiated. We regret the wrong often done to their character, and the injury inflicted on their feelings, by an indiscriminate warfare on names. But they must

remember that there is, properly implied in the name they wear, that upon which self-defence compels an American citizen to wage implacable war, and that they must charge the wrong they think done them, to the false and undefined position in which they stand: for though *they* may change, *Romanism*, properly so called, cannot change. There may be, in this country, for centuries to come, those calling themselves Roman Catholics, yet asserting for themselves and others freedom of faith, of worship, and of conscience; and, while nominally adhering to the decisions of the 'universal church,' may, by interpretation and construction of these œcumenical decrees, find latitude for the widest and wildest excursiveness of the human reason—a body rejecting her spiritual despotism and superstitions, the doctrines of saintly intercession and virgin worship, of penance and justification by works, of clerical celibacy, and of indulgences, of venal pardon, and the right of persecution, of paramount allegiance to Rome, and the exclusive salvableness of those within her pale—such a class as probably M. De Tocqueville himself belongs to; there may exist in this country a sect of this description, nominally adhering to the papacy; yet they will not be papists, and when they are the sole representatives of that name in this republic, papacy in this country, however great the number of her nominal adherents, is dead. We should not be surprised if this were the process of her dissolution. But we must never forget that these are not Romanists, nor be lulled into the delusive belief of the amended or mitigated nature of Romanism herself. This can never be. Amendment or mitigation, with reference to her, are absurdities and self-contradictions. She cannot cease to be a spiritual despotism, without ceasing to be at all; for this is her essence. In this country she can live only by hypocrisy and disguise—she plays the Jesuit, and bides her time. Real amendment is to her annihilation; vital reform is suicide. All other despotisms have some power of assimilation, and are striving to eke out their lifetime by conciliating the spirit of the age. We see this verified in the present policy of Russia, Prussia, Turkey, and Persia, and other absolute governments. But Romanism cannot repent, or change; with her, to accommodate is only to dissemble—conciliation is but conspiracy. Her past assumption and tyranny she cannot renounce—she cannot plead immaturity, or ignorance, or error. All the arrogance, and the crimes that attach to her days of pride, she must continue to wear. Her purple of infallibility she cannot put off, though she finds it a shirt of torture. It cleaves to her, and is part of her—not a shred can she tear off—not a thread can she whiten—with all her stains of sensuality and blood uncleansed—her titles of arrogance and her names of blasphemy emblazoned upon it, she must wear it down through the light of the nineteenth century.

If our language seem to our Roman Catholic fellow-citizens unduly

severe, or wanting in a discriminate charity, our reply is, we war with things, not names. To the terms Papacy or Romanism, we must attach the significancy developed in the crimson dictionary of history. By these terms we mean things. We mean a system self-bound to immutability. That system cannot change—an attempt to renovate or amend it, would be as fatal as that of the daughters of Pelias to restore their aged father to the graces and vigour of youth. Thus, whatever her nominal adherents may profess, the papacy itself is self-stereotyped. Pursued by the furies of crimes, she cannot repent—the shadows of her pride and power waiting in mockery around her decrepitude—her imperial scarlet become a Nessian tunic—wearing the likeness of a crown she cannot throw off, though it burns her brow—her feet slipping in the gore of her innumerable slain—the crosier, the scourge, the brand, and the rusted keys, still clutched in her trembling hands, she must go down to the coming ages. What she has been, she must be or die,—or rather, must be and die.

And are we to believe that around this shadow of ghostly power the democratic ages are to be attracted?—that they will rally to the support of her tottering steps, and kiss her sandals mottled with the gore of a thousand years, and bow in the dust before that eye, the light of whose cruel majesty has long since faded?—that they will sluice their own veins to feed her failing life-streams—and for her wage battle and death? No, hers will be a retinue, not of living nations, but a pale host of such shadows as gathered on the soul of Richard on the field of Bosworth. On her steps will attend, not the accents of living acclaim, but voices like those from under the altar in the Apocalypse, swelling from a thousand heights and dales—from the city and the waste—from the Escurials and the Bastiles of half the globe—from the glens of the Alps, the plains of Provence and Holland—from the heaths of England, the mountains of Hungary, the sierras, and the Apennines—from a thousand years of darkened intellect, and abused faith, and seared conscience, and broken hearts, and lost souls—from stifled human reason and bleeding human nature—from outraged man and from blasphemed Heaven, will gather over her in one mighty cloud of accusation, and arraign her for the grave. Such will be the attendants of her final hour. The pomp the democratic ages will form for her, will be that of her funeral—the train they will bear, will be the robe of her sepulture—the chant they will sing, will be the psæan of the prophet of Israel over the monarch of Babylon.

That the coming era, then, will not be one of the triumph of Romanism, is, we think, as clear in the light of philosophy as of revelation. Nor is this conclusion invalidated by the recent movement of the English church towards Rome. This movement indicates no tendency of the democratic ages, but is in direct opposition to their spirit. It is not the product of our times, but of antagonist principles grafted

on the English church the century succeeding the Reformation—the hybrid papacy of the Stuarts attempted to be held in combination with protestantism. Our age simply witnesses the explosion. It is no farther responsible for Puseyism or Anglo-Romanism, than because its unceasing light and heat will not permit conflicting principles to be combined in the same system, but compels each to develop its affinities and disclose its consequences.

STATISTICS OF CRIME AND OF CREED.

CONSCIENTIOUS nonconformity to the prevailing religion around, may be supposed to induce in its professors greater circumspection of conduct, and a higher character for virtue and goodness. Abraham in Chaldea—Israel in Egypt—the Jews in Babylon—the Christians at Jerusalem, Antioch, and Rome, were dissenters from the established system of religion, and their conduct may be appealed to in confirmation of our hypothesis. The Pharisees, as a sect, had a higher standard of moral conduct than their countrymen; and though many of them were hypocritical, devouring widows' houses, while for a pretence they made long prayers, yet as a class they were like their brother Saul of Tarsus, who, touching the true righteousness which is of the law, was "blameless." The Pietists and Momiers of France and Germany—the Covenanters of Scotland—and the Puritans and early Methodists of England, have all been characterised by, and reproached for the strictness of their manners, and the high standard of their morality. The maxim of our Divine Master, "by their fruits ye shall know them," supplies a certain and a searching test of the characters of colleges and schools, of churches and individuals. The obligations imposed by their position and principles have not been forgotten by evangelical dissenters in the present day, who desire to keep themselves "unspotted from the world," and who have spent no small amount of time and property to teach the rising generation the same important lesson. In the heat of the discussions occasioned by the proposed Factory Education Bill, full credit was not given them for their labours in this respect; and we regret that, in some quarters, most ungenerous and unjust imputations were cast upon them "for not educating their people at all, or not educating them in that effectual and experimental manner, which tells on the character, conscience, and conduct."

The Rev. Hugh Stowell, of Christ Church, Manchester, publicly uttered these reproaches, which he attempted to substantiate by referring to the records of the New Bailey prison in that town. He stated, at the Corn Exchange, that, in the space of one year, 360 young persons, under seventeen, had been committed to that jail, the great proportion of whom were deplorably ignorant; and that, of that number, only 117 belonged to the church, while 243 to different denominations

of dissenters. This most startling statement could not, of course, be allowed to pass current without investigation. Happily the statistics of the prison were as accessible to the dissenting ministers of Manchester as to their clerical neighbours. The Rev. James Gwyther, pastor of the Congregational church, Sion Chapel, Hulme, applied himself to this inquiry, and the facts he had to adduce are these:—The number of juvenile offenders, felons and others, under seventeen years of age, committed to the New Bailey from October 1839 to October 1842, is 975. Of these, 457 belong to the established church; 278 are Roman Catholics; 65 profess to belong to no religious persuasion; of eight it is stated that their religion is unknown; two are Socialists; one is a Jew; leaving to Protestant dissenters of *all sects*, only 164: that is to say, about *one-sixth* of the total number.

This important conclusion, which so completely turns the argument against Mr. Stowell, is sustained by the tables Mr. Gwyther procured, but which we regret are too extensive for our pages; the following are their most important facts:

The religious professions of juvenile offenders, from seven to sixteen years of age; felons, 302, those summarily convicted, 673, making a total of 975, who were imprisoned in the New Bailey, Manchester, from October 1839 to October 1842.

Episcopalians	457
Roman Catholics	278
Dissenters as under—	
Methodists	116
Calvinists	12
Baptists	12
Presbyterians	6
Unitarians	4
Swedenborgian	1
Ranters	4
Latter-day Saint	1
Independents	2
Sects "unknown"	6
	— 164
Jew	1
Socialists	2
Religion unknown	8
"None"	65
	— 76
Total	975

As to the state of their education, there were 262 belonging to the church who could not read at all—175 Catholics, and 81 dissenters. This discussion at Manchester led to an examination of the creeds of criminals in general at some other prisons. Edward Dawson, Esq., of Aldcliffe Hall, obtained the returns of prisoners confined in Lancaster Castle from January 1842 to April 1843, which were published in *The Patriot* as follow:

Episcopalians	471
Roman Catholics	107
Dissenters as under—	
Methodists	59
Baptists	9
Presbyterians	8
Independents	4
Calvinists	2
Primitive Methodist	1
Unitarian	1
	<hr/> 84
Jews	3
“None”	10
	<hr/> 13
Total	<hr/> 675

The returns of the chaplain of Preston House of Correction, printed in February last, are equally unfortunate for Mr. Stowell's argument.

Episcopalians	266
Roman Catholics	144
Dissenters as under—	
Methodists	29
Presbyterians	6
Independents	12
Baptists	5
	<hr/> 52
Uncertain	3
	<hr/> 465

Another clerical witness has been summoned from the House of Correction at Kirkdale Lane, in the same county, to give evidence on the question; and the results of his statistics are not more favourable to the pre-eminent goodness of the teaching of the church of England. At the assizes, sessions, and special commissions of 1842, there were, it seems, 795 prisoners. The following classification will tell the result :

Episcopalians	540
Roman Catholics	180
Dissenters as under—	
Methodists	37
Presbyterians	7
Baptists	6
Independents	3
Calvinists	6
Ranters	2
Swedenborgian	1
Quaker	1
	<hr/> 63
“None”	12
	<hr/> 795

These figures will be thought conclusive as far as the county of Lancaster is concerned, and the returns of other counties would not, we suspect, prove to be more satisfactory.

The Middlesex House of Correction supplied, three or four years ago, the following returns :

Episcopalians	719
Roman Catholics	137
Dissenters as under—	
Methodists	11
Presbyterians	11
Baptists	2
Independent	1
	<hr/> 25
Jews	6
	<hr/> 887

If a general return of the creeds of all criminals was ordered by the House of Commons, the foolish boasting of such zealots as Mr. Stowell would be effectually silenced.

We say foolish, because, apart from the character of their teaching, it is most plain that Nonconformists of every class must feel it to be a point of honour, to vindicate their dissent by their circumspection. They must always hear the pointed question of the Lord, "What do ye more than others?" and aim to prove themselves to be "a peculiar people, zealous of good works." This is found to be the case in a neighbouring country also. Protestantism is the nonconformity of France, as its professors dissent from popery, the established religion of that kingdom. There, as in our own land, certain writers have wished to raise the established system of religious instruction at the expense of the Protestant churches, and to extol the influence of the Roman Catholic doctrines and discipline, in order to depreciate those of the reformed. They have, therefore, asserted, with great confidence and apparent impartiality, that the number of Protestant criminals is greater in proportion, than of the Roman Catholic church. Some Protestant gentlemen have, therefore, inquired into the number of unhappy prisoners of each communion that were confined in 1841 in their bagnios and houses of correction; and in *L'Almanach Protestant*, for 1842, we have the results of their investigation in the following summary :

The Catholic population of France is 33 millions, and the condemned of that communion were 23,748, or as one criminal out of 1389 Roman Catholics.

The Protestant population of France is one million and a half, and the condemned of that communion were 592, or as one criminal out of 2533 Protestants.

The Protestant population of the kingdom being in the proportion of 1 to 20, the criminals should be in the same proportion; whereas,

in point of fact, they are as 1 to 40. Two Roman Catholics are, therefore, condemned for one Protestant, which fact must silence those who contend for the superior moral influence of popery to protestantism on the popular mind.

These "facts and figures" deserve alike the careful consideration of the churchman and the statesman, and doubtless, ought to be sufficient to check those ungenerous aspersions and sweeping censures which have been cast upon the Nonconforming bodies both in Great Britain and France.

NUMBER OF THE CONGREGATIONAL CHURCHES.

THE latest and most correct returns of the Congregational churches are as follow :—

Great Britain—

England	1927
Wales	479
Scotland	112
Ireland, and the Channel Isles	31
	— 2549

British Colonies—

Atlantic Settlements	50
Australian ditto	13
	— 63
United States of America	1500
	—
Total number of Churches	4112
	—

These do not include isolated churches in various parts of Europe, and those which have been gathered from amongst the heathen in all parts of the world, by the labours of missionaries sent forth by British and American Congregational churches.

Some Reflections which were penned many years ago by the venerable William Jay, are increasingly applicable to the churches and ministers of the Independent denomination at the present time.

"By inspecting these churches, a man may see how Christian societies are formed, where nothing but toleration is expected from the secular power. He will see that in these communities there is nothing compulsory; all is founded in conviction, in choice, in spiritual friendship. He will see that the calling of the Christian does not sacrifice, but ratifies and sanctifies the rights of the man. He may compare these societies with the primitive churches, when no system was established or endowed. He may observe the adaptation there is in

them to diffuse themselves, and to multiply; their fitness for missionary exertions; their simple, unperplexed, unembarrassed mode of operation in evangelising a heathen country. He may compare them with the profit of the individuals composing them; with the injunctions of Scripture to watch over one another, to consider one another, to provoke one another to love and to good works—with the admonition of the apostle, 'Comfort yourselves together, and edify one another, even as ye do.' 'Warn them that are unruly, comfort the feeble-minded, support the weak, be patient unto all men'—with the exercise of brotherly reproof, the support of discipline, the purity of the Lord's table, and our Lord's rule—'If thy brother shall trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone. If he shall hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother; but if he will not hear thee, then take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established. And if he shall neglect to hear them, tell it unto the church; but if he neglect to hear the church, let him be unto thee as a heathen man and a publican.'—He may take occasion from hence, to inquire, whether there is anything like mystery in church government. He may ask, whether it was necessary for the Scripture to frame any particular or definite system upon the subject. He will see whether the influence which the Gospel supplies, and the general laws it lays down, are not sufficient to guide us in all circumstances; and whether, as where there is no law there is no transgression, any injury can result from different administrations, varying with times and circumstances, and equally allowing of communion with God and social edification.

"But some may be ready to ask, What authority had such men to preach at all? And the question is easily answered with regard to their own people,—their choice and approbation; with regard to the country in which they reside,—the law of the land acknowledging, sanctioning, and protecting their labours; with regard to God,—command, inclination, capacity, opportunity, success. Some things are usually and some things are usefully connected with the ministerial office, that are by no means inseparable from the essence of it. Some are not regularly inducted, nor have had an academical entrance. We are far from despising order; or supposing that learning is of little importance. Institutions established to prepare men for their public work, are of great utility; and as God has, in the course of his providence, furnished our churches with them, we would earnestly recommend that those who are encouraged to give up themselves to the ministry of the Word, should avail themselves of the advantage. At the present season we should the more urge it, not only for the invaluable benefits derivable from them, but to suit the character of the times, and the state of many congregations, in which mere zeal would not, as formerly, secure attention; and also to keep back many, who, as one justly

s-
of
m
na
co
n
r,
e-
e
s
,
l
,
r
t
e
s
i

o
e
th
b
a
l
t
o
e
v
h
h
n
o
r

observes, while they declaim against *men-made* preachers, are fond enough of *self-made* preachers, and go forth with no advice but from their ignorance—with no consultation but with their own presumption, by which, so many settled ministers have thorns planted in their nests, and schisms formed and upheld in their neighbourhoods. Of old, in Israel, there were schools of the prophets, from which God generally took his servants; and thus he honoured the use of means. But he occasionally called a messenger from a different condition; and by endowing and succeeding him, showed that he was not bound to the use of them. And he does the same now. He gives us rules to go by; but he will not confine himself. While he discountenances the fanatic, he can pour contempt upon the formalist; and teach those who love means, not to idolise them. And when he produces exceptions, the circumstances will justify them; and the general rule will be confirmed, rather than invalidated.*

NOTICE OF THE WYCLIFFE SOCIETY.

THE object of this Society, whose advertisement appears in our advertising pages, is, we believe, generally known to our readers: we are anxious to bespeak in its behalf their kind and prompt attention.

The subscription list must be closed on the 31st instant. On the numbers contained in that list will depend when the Society shall commence operations. As the Provisional Committee are pledged not to publish, nor would it be safe for them to do so, without the full complement of paid-up Subscriptions, they are anxiously awaiting the arrival of the last day of the year, in order that their course may be finally determined upon. The earlier intimation is given of intention to subscribe, the more encouraging and gratifying will it be to the Committee; and should the proposed number of 1500 be ascertained before the day in question, they will proceed forthwith to press, in the hope of placing a volume or two in the hands of the Subscribers at an early period in 1844.

In addition to the ordinary claim of our olden ecclesiastical literature on the respect and veneration of all Nonconformists, there is special reason for resuscitating it at the present moment. The Anglo-Catholic Library, and the Parker Society, are reprinting the works of the orthodox and evangelical Reformers in the English church. The Wodrow and the Spottiswode Societies propose reprinting the corresponding writings of divines in the Scottish church.

Most desirable is it, therefore, that the works of the Reformers, Puritans, and Nonconformists, who advocated religious reformation on Scripture principles only, even, in many cases, to the complete separa-

* Memoir of the late John Clark. Works, vol. viii. pp. 414—417.

tion of the church from all state support, influence, and control, should be reprinted with those of the other classes of Reformers, in order that the whole question of ecclesiastical reformation, both in a former and in the present age, may be fully examined and understood.

The Wycliffe Society proposes to supply this desideratum. No other party, private or public, is likely to embark in such an undertaking. It remains, therefore, for the friends of Nonconformity and sound Protestant literature, to avail themselves at once of the safe and facile plan of this Society, to bring back again to light the writings of men of whom the world was not worthy, and of whom we feel it to be an honour to be called descendants.

ORDINATIONS.

(Continued from page 968.)

ON Wednesday, October 4th, 1843, the Rev. Dr. Jackson (late of Highbury College) was ordained pastor of the church assembling at Trinity Chapel, Sudbury. The Rev. E. Prout, of Halsted, commenced the solemn services of the day with reading appropriate portions of Scripture and with prayer. The principles of non-conformity were fully and forcibly set forth by the Rev. J. Carter, of Braintree. The Rev. R. Skinner, of Hadleigh, proposed the usual questions, which being satisfactorily answered, the Rev. T. Craig, of Bocking, offered the ordination prayer. The charge was then delivered by the Rev. Dr. Henderson, President of Highbury College, founded on 1 Tim. iii. 15, in which the duties of a pastor in and out of "the house of God" was clearly explained and affectionately enforced. In the evening, the Rev. J. Whitby, of Ipsworth, preached an excellent sermon to the people from 1 Thes. v. 12, 13. Besides the above-named ministers, there were present the Rev. Messrs. Anderson (Baptist), Coleman, Clements (Baptist), Elliott, Frazer (of Edinburgh), Harris, Hollis, Higgs (Baptist), Humphreys (Baptist), Johnson (of Stoke), Millis, Moore, Butler, Shear, Watkinson, and J. D. Williams (of Highbury College), most of whom took some part in the service. The Chapel was crowded on both occasions with a highly respectable and very attentive congregation.

Latelý, the Rev. Jeremiah Jones was publicly ordained pastor of the Independent church at Abergele, Denbighshire. The Rev. Jonah Lloyd, of Denbigh, commenced the service. The Rev. W. Williams, of Caernarvon, delivered the introductory discourse. The usual questions were asked by the Rev. O. Owens, of Rhos y cae. The Rev. J. Evans, of Corwen, offered the special prayer for the pastor and the church. The charge to the young minister was delivered (in English) by the Rev. Samuel Bowen, of Macclesfield; and the Rev. E. Davies, of Newmarket, preached to the people. The Revs. D. W. Jones, of Holywell; W. Davies, of Salem; D. James, of Rhonymbairch; W. Thomas, of Dwygyfylchi; J. Roberts, of Capel Garmon; W. Roberts, of Llanddeusant; T. Pierce, and R. Thomas, of Liverpool; took part in the different proceedings, on the Wednesday evening, and Thursday afternoon and evening. Sermons were also delivered on the previous Sabbath, by the Rev. J. Roberts, of Llanbrynmair. As this was the first Congregational ordination ever held in that place, the people seemed to take particular interest in the proceedings.

On Tuesday, October 31st, the Rev. T. Lee, late of Highbury College, was ordained pastor of the church and congregation worshipping in Church-street Chapel, Epsom, Surrey. The Rev. S. Percy, of Guildford, opened the morning service by reading the

Scriptures and prayer; the Rev. R. Connebee, of Dorking, explained the nature of a Christian church; the Rev. Dr. Hewlett, of Coventry, proposed the usual questions, and received the confession of faith; the Rev. T. Dix, of Bedworth, offered the ordination prayer; the Rev. E. Henderson, D.D. Ph.D., theological tutor of Highbury College, delivered the charge; and the Rev. J. Churchill, of Thames Ditton, concluded the service with prayer. The Rev. J. Waraker, of Tooting; the Rev. F. Perkins, of Leatherhead; and the Rev. T. B. Barker, of Epsom, also took parts of the service. In the evening the Rev. James Hill, of Clapham, preached to the people, and thus closed the engagements of the day, which we earnestly hope may be attended with the blessing of God.

RECENT DEATH.

It is with deep regret we have to announce the death of JAMES BALDWIN BROWN, Esq., LL.D., of the Inner Temple, barrister-at-law, who departed this life November 23rd, 1843, in the 55th year of his age.

This gentleman early attached himself to the cause of Congregational Non-conformity, and devoted his best energies to maintain those noble principles of religious liberty on which they were based. As a member of the Board of Dissenting Deputies, and as Treasurer to the Protestant Society for the Protection of Religious Liberty, he was indefatigable.

His literary labours in the same cause were varied and abundant; but we hope to be able more fully to record his useful services.